DEC 21 1960

LIBRARY
EVANGELICAL SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY

Gift of
Mrs. M. E. Ritzman

THE NEW TESTAMENT
IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
DALLAS · SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

A SURVEY OF RECENT CHRISTOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY THE

REV. MAURICE JONES, D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF ST. DAVID'S COLLEGE, LAMPETER

BS
2350
J6
1924
50,840

15652

The Evangelical
School of Theology

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON
1924

J

COPYRIGHT

First Edition 1914
Second Edition 1924

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

THE First Edition of this book, which was published in 1914, two months before the outbreak of the Great War, and was only preserved from an early demise by the generous appreciation of the few who had leisure for theological reading, having been exhausted, the opportunity is now offered to me of putting forth a Second Edition, in which the many misprints and small errors which appeared in the original are corrected. The bibliographies attached to the various chapters have also been brought up to date, and a list of the relevant books published since 1914 is supplied on pp. xvii-xx.

The last ten years, four of which were occupied by the war, have not been unduly productive in the realm of New Testament criticism, and comparatively few additions or modifications are needed to bring the book into line with the situation which prevails in that realm to-day. The following brief notes may, however, be helpful to the reader, and may enable him to get into touch with the actual changes and advances that the last decade has witnessed.

BOOK I

CHAPTER II. *Liberal Protestant Christology.*—If the original edition had been published now instead of

in 1914, much less attention would have been paid to the Liberal Protestant School in Germany. German theology of this type has been largely discredited as the result of the war, and is now, temporarily at least, under an eclipse. Liberal thought in this country is, however, worthily represented by the "Churchmen's Union," whose position is set forth with marked ability in the Journal of the Union, *The Modern Churchman.*

CHAPTER III. "*Jesus or Christ.*"—The "tentative Christology" of Dr. Sanday (p. 34) has definitely failed to commend itself to thinkers generally, and may now be consigned to the limbo of things forgotten.

CHAPTER V. *The "Christ-Myth."*—This chapter might now be omitted without any serious inconvenience, but it is, to say the least, interesting to note that the "Christ-Myth" theory received its *coup de grâce* from Mr. F. C. Conybeare, who cannot be accused of partiality for traditional views. See *The Historical Christ* (1914).

CHAPTER VI. *The Christ of Eschatology.*—The eschatological teaching of Christ occupies now a much less prominent place in literature dealing with the Gospels than it did ten years ago, and the phase which reduced our Lord's moral teaching to a mere "Interims-ethik" is rapidly passing away. Miss L. Dougall and the Rev. C. W. Emmet, whose lamented deaths in 1923 have left the theological world appreciably poorer, attempted to prove in *The Lord of Thought,* and, it must be confessed, with indifferent success. that the records of Christ's teaching had been seriously affected by Jewish Apocalyptic writings, and that a substantial proportion of the eschatological element contained in the Synoptic

Gospels was due to the Evangelists rather than to Christ Himself. But although this may be an extreme position to adopt, it is now being generally recognised that Schweitzer and his school attached an importance to His eschatological outlook that is not justified by a sound and reasonable exegesis.

CHAPTERS IV. and VII. *"Jesus or Paul." St. Paul and the Mystery Religions.*—The most living issue in New Testament criticism to-day is unquestionably the definition of the relation of St. Paul to Christ and of the extent of the Apostle's indebtedness to his Hellenistic environment. Far-reaching claims are being made by a powerful group of scholars in England, America, and Germany on behalf of the influence of contemporary paganism on the Apostle's thought and teaching, and it is confidently asserted that the Gospel of St. Paul presents us with a body of presumably Christian doctrine in which there is found little, if any, trace of relationship to the teaching of Jesus Christ, or to that of the primitive Apostolic Church. Pauline Christianity, according to this view, is completely divorced from the historical Jesus and His teaching, and is a mere syncretism composed of elements borrowed in almost every instance from pagan religion. A mere glance at the books in the bibliography which are credited to Bousset, Loisy, and K. Lake, will provide ample proof that the preceding statement is not an exaggeration. A very frank and thorough criticism of what is, to my mind, a perverted and utterly unjustifiable estimate of Pauline Christianity will be found in Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (1921).

CHAPTER VIII. *The Language of the New Testament.*—The effect of recent discoveries in the shape

of inscriptions, papyri, and ostraka upon our conception of the character of New Testament Greek is very apparent in the Lexicons and Grammars published since 1914. Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary*, Abbott Smith's *Lexicon*, and A. T. Robertson's *Grammar* do full justice to the fresh knowledge now at our disposal, and all three should prove of the greatest value to the student of the New Testament.

BOOK II

CHAPTER I. *The Synoptic Problem.*—The Synoptic Problem continues to attract a considerable amount of interest. The "two-document" hypothesis, which forms the key of the solution presented in this volume, is being freely canvassed. The Rev. W. Lockton, in an article on "The Origin of the Gospels" in the *Church Quarterly Review* for July 1922, argues that *St. Luke* is our earliest Gospel and that *St. Mark* is based upon it, while H. G. Jameson devotes the greater part of his "Origin of the Synoptic Gospels" to the attempt to prove that *St. Matthew* was written before *St. Mark* and that "Q" is a purely mythical product of the critical imagination. It is understood that a full treatment of the Synoptic Problem and its difficulties may soon be expected from Canon B. H. Streeter, our greatest authority on the subject.

CHAPTER II. *The Acts of the Apostles.*—The most important contribution to the study of *Acts* in recent years is the second volume of *The Beginnings of Christianity* (1922), by Jackson and Lake. The case for the Lucan authorship is ably stated by C. W. Emmet, while the contrary position is upheld by H. Windisch. The editors themselves, although, if

one may judge from other sections of the volume, they are not strongly impressed by the traditional theory, express no definite opinion on the matter in question. The book is a perfect mine of valuable information bearing upon *Acts*, and deserves careful study.

A very able piece of work also is McLachlan, *St. Luke: the Man and his Work* (1920), in which he shows the value of the "Western Text" for the elucidation of St. Luke's narrative in *Acts*.

CHAPTER III. *The Pauline Epistles.*—The only two points that need be touched upon in connection with this chapter are the vexed questions of the date of *Galatians* and of the authorship of *The Pastoral Epistles*.

Burton, in his authoritative Commentary on *Galatians* (I.C.C., 1921), places the writing of the Epistle at Ephesus, during St. Paul's Third Missionary Journey (A.D. 52–55), which would dispose of the suggestion which has recently found favour in many quarters, that it was written before the Apostolic Council and was, consequently, the earliest of all the Pauline Epistles.

Several commentaries of real value have been published on *The Pastoral Epistles* during the last ten years, such as E. F. Brown's (1918), A. E. Hillard's (1921), and R. St. John Parry's (1921), in all of which the authorship is ascribed to St. Paul. C. H. Turner, in his *Study of the New Testament*, 1883 and 1920, also sees no good reasons for withholding these Epistles from the Apostle.

On the other hand, P. N. Harrison, in his *Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, in which the language of the Epistles is examined and discussed with a fullness and

clearness and impressiveness of statement which have never been equalled, maintains that in their present form they cannot be the direct work of the Apostle, but have been built up upon the basis of fragments of his correspondence by an earnest Paulinist of the second century. Dr. Harrison's masterly work is of immeasurable value to the student of the *Pastorals*, and, in the face of it, it becomes increasingly difficult to cling to the traditional theory of their authorship.

CHAPTERS VIII. AND IX. *The Fourth Gospel.*—The Fourth Gospel and the many problems connected with it still remain a focus of interest. Its structure, sources, and authorship have been freely and frankly discussed during the last decade. Critical opinion, on the whole, seems to be hardening against the Johannine authorship, and, while there is a tendency to exalt the historical value of the Gospel, scholars tend more and more to look for the author in another direction than that of St. John, the son of Zebedee.

Stanton devotes the whole of the third volume of *The Gospels as Historical Documents* to the Fourth Gospel, but although he believes that it was written by one who had seen Christ during His life on earth and had intimate acquaintance with His disciples, he does not believe that it was written by the Apostle John.

Charles, in his Commentary on *Revelation*, while holding that the Gospel and Johannine Epistles are by the same hand, is of opinion that no Johannine book was written by the Apostle of that name.

Garvie, in *The Beloved Disciple*, which contains a series of critical studies on the Gospel, discovers three different hands in its composition—an eye-witness, the Evangelist who utilised the written records of the

eye-witness, and a redactor, but the eye-witness was not the Apostle St. John, but a beloved disciple and close friend of the Master, who accompanied him in Judaea, but not in Galilee.[1]

Burney, in *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, sets out to prove that an Aramaic original underlies the Greek text of the Gospel, and so opens up a new and suggestive line of inquiry. But although he is firmly convinced of the soundness of his thesis and holds that an Aramaic original existed at a much earlier date than is generally associated with the Fourth Gospel, Burney finds the author not in St. John the Apostle, but in John the Presbyter.

The only names of importance on the contrary side are those of Bishop Gore, who, in *Belief in God* (p. 203), expresses his very definite opinion that St. John, the son of Zebedee, is the author of the Gospel, and of the late Canon H. Scott Holland, who, in a contribution published after his death, *The Fourth Gospel*, pleads with wonderful insight and persuasiveness for the traditional view.

Chapter XI. *The Apocalypse of St. John.*—The most important event since 1914 in connection with the study of the Apocalypse was the appearance of Charles' monumental Commentary on the book in two volumes in 1920 representing the fruit of more than twenty years' devoted work. He accepts the truth of the tradition discussed in pp. 377-379 of this volume, that St. John the Apostle fell a martyr before A.D. 60 and wrote no part of the New Testament. The Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles were written by John the Presbyter, the Apocalypse by

[1] See also G. H. Macgregor, "How far is the Fourth Gospel a Unity?" in *Expositor*, August 1922, March and November 1923.

another John—the Prophet. He also thinks that no less than a fifth part of the book is derived from various sources which are skilfully worked in so as not to destroy its real unity. He has discovered an editor also, for whose qualities he has nothing but the deepest contempt. He is, according to Charles, generally stupid and sometimes even dishonest. In spite, however, of some idiosyncrasies and a good deal of undue dogmatism, this Commentary is a work which reflects the highest credit upon English scholarship.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

THE aim of the present volume is to provide a survey of twentieth-century criticism of the New Testament, both in its Christological and historical aspects. For this purpose it is divided into two sections, the one containing an outlook upon the trend of modern Christology, together with two additional chapters on "St. Paul and the Mystery Religions," and on "The Language of the New Testament," while the second section is entirely devoted to the consideration of the latest New Testament criticism on its literary and historical sides. In the combination of these two features in one and the same volume the writer hopes there may be found ample justification for the issue of a work which may be regarded, in some limited sense, as an *Introduction to the New Testament*, and for adding another to the many excellent *Introductions* from the hands of scholars of repute which already occupy the field.

The title of the volume, *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*, will explain why, in the second section, several of the New Testament documents are hardly touched upon at all. The book advances no claim to be considered an exhaustive *Introduction to the New Testament*, and its purpose is intentionally restricted to the task of collecting and collating

within a small compass what the highest scholarship of the present century has to say with reference to those matters which have not yet emerged out of the region of controversy. Thus, in dealing with the Synoptic Gospels no attempt is made to treat each Gospel separately, and attention has been entirely concentrated upon the problem of their mutual relations. It is upon the Synoptic *problem*, and not upon the Gospels singly, that criticism has been focused in recent years. Similarly in the chapter on " St. Paul's Epistles " the greater number of the Apostle's letters, and among them some of the most important ones, are passed over in all but complete silence. Here, again, one need only point out that the best criticism of the age has made up its mind concerning the genuineness of the great bulk of the Pauline Epistles, and it was necessary, therefore, to deal only with those letters, concerning the authenticity of which a certain amount of hesitation, small or great, is still felt.

My indebtedness to a large circle of scholars is manifest throughout the book, and is, I trust, duly acknowledged in every instance. I desire, however, to express my special appreciation of the assistance I derived, in the second section of the volume, from Dr. Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, and more particularly from the bibliographies, which I found quite invaluable. The chapter on " The Language of the New Testament " appeared originally in the *Church Quarterly Review*, and is published here with the permission of the proprietors of that journal.

Two books, containing the Hulsean Lectures at Cambridge for 1912, and the Bampton Lectures at

Oxford for 1913, respectively, have appeared since the following pages were set up in print, which bear somewhat closely upon some of the subjects dealt with in the present volume. *The Eschatology of Jesus*, by Dr. Latimer Jackson, in spite of the author's tendency to accept too readily the contentions of advanced German criticism, is a very valuable contribution to this much-discussed question.

Mr. Edmundson's lectures on *The Church of Rome in the First Century* manifest all the qualities of a learned and trained historian. His work is interesting in connection with the present volume because of his novel and independent dating of many of the early Christian documents. The following list of documents, with their dates as given by him, will illustrate his position in this respect. St. Mark 44-45, St. Luke 58-59, Acts, before 62, Epistle to the Hebrews 66, Apocalypse 70, before the destruction of Jerusalem, Epistle of Clement 70, *Shepherd of Hermas*, about 90. I do not imagine that the early placing of these documents will commend itself to the majority of New Testament scholars, and the dates assigned to the Epistle of Clement and the *Shepherd of Hermas* are bound to meet with vehement opposition. The ascription of the Apocalypse to St. John the Apostle and the identification of the Apostle with the "Presbyter" of that name are hardly in accord with present-day criticism.

A point of some importance with reference to the contentions of the "Christ-Myth" school (see Book I. Chapter V.) is the acknowledgment of the genuineness of the famous passage concerning Jesus in the *Antiquities* of Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 3), by Professor Burkitt, and also by Professor Emery Barnes (*Contemporary*

Review, January 1913), a conclusion which Harnack regards as proved almost beyond doubt (*Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst, und Technik*). This passage, which had for centuries been almost universally regarded as a Christian interpolation, cuts at the very roots of the "Christ-Myth" theory, and disposes completely of the vagaries of Drews and J. M. Robertson.

MAURICE JONES.

GOSPORT, *March* 1914.

LIST OF RELEVANT BOOKS PUBLISHED SINCE 1914

FOR BOOK I

Chapters II and III

Weinel, *Jesus in the Nineteenth Century and After.* 1914.
Loofs, *What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?* 1914.
C. E. Raven, *What think ye of Christ?* 1917.
The Modern Churchman. September 1921.
C. Gore, *Belief in Christ.* 1921.
A. C. Headlam, *The Life and Teaching of Jesus.* 1922.
Berguer, *Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus.* 1923.

Chapter IV

C. G. Montefiore, *Judaism and St. Paul.* 1914.
K. Lake, *The Stewardship of Faith.* 1915.
W. Morgan, *The Religion and Theology of Paul.* 1917.
Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity.* Vol. I. 1920.
K. Lake, *Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity.* 1920.
F. G. Peabody, *The Apostle Paul and the Modern World.* 1923.
A. H. M'Neile, *New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's.* 1923
Deissmann, *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul.* 1923.

Chapter V

F. C. Conybeare, *The Historical Christ.* 1914.
T. J. Thorburn, *The Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels.* 1917.

Chapter VI

H. L. Jackson, *The Eschatology of Jesus.* 1914.
F. C. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses.* 1914.
F. Streatfield, *Preparing the Way.* 1918.
L. Dougall and C. W. Emmet, *The Lord of Thought.* 1922.

Chapter VII

P. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römisch Kultur.* 1912.
Bousset, *Kyrios Christos.* 1913.
Clemen, *Der Einfluss der Mysterien-Religionen auf das älteste Christentum.* 1913.
J. G. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris.* 1914.
Groton, *The Eucharist and Pagan Cults.* 1915.
K. Lake, *The Stewardship of Faith.* 1915.
W. Morgan, *The Religion and Theology of Paul.* 1917.
S. J. Case, *The Evolution of Early Christianity.* 1918.
A. Loisy, *Les Mystères païens et le mystère chrétien.* 1919.
Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity.* Vol. I. 1920.
K. Lake, *Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity.* 1920.
E. Bevan, *Hellenism and Christianity.* 1921.
J. G. Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion.* 1922.

Chapter VIII

Lexicons:

Moulton and Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament.* Parts I.-V. 1914–1923.
A. Souter, *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament.* 1916.
G. Abbott Smith, *Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament.* 1922.

Grammars:

A. T. Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament.* 1921.
J. H. Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek.* Vol. II. Parts i. ii. iii. 1919–1923.

G. Milligan, *Here and there among the Papyri.* 1922.
Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten.* (New Edition). 1922.

FOR BOOK II

Literature dealing with the New Testament as a whole.

Allen and Grensted, *Introduction to the New Testament.* 1914.
J. Weiss, *Urchristentum.* 1914.
S. Angus, *The Environment of Early Christianity.* 1915.
C. F. Nolloth, *The Rise of the Christian Religion.* 1917.
C. H. Turner, *The Study of the New Testament, 1883 and 1920.* 1920.
J. Moffatt, *The Approach to the New Testament.*
J. E. Symes, *The Evolution of the New Testament.* 1921.

G. W. Wade, *New Testament History.* 1922.
E. F. Scott, *The New Testament to-day.* 1923.
R. H. Malden, *Problems of the New Testament to-day.* 1923.

Chapter I

R. Smith, *The Solution of the Synoptic Problem.* 1920.
Maurice Jones, *The Four Gospels.* 1921.
B. H. Streeter, "Fresh Light on the Synoptic Problem" (*Hibbert Journal*). 1921.
H. G. Jameson, *Origin of the Synoptic Gospels.* 1922.

Chapter II

C. C. Torrey, *The Composition and Date of Acts.* 1917.
H. J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of St. Luke.* Vols. I. II. 1918–1921.
M. McLachlan, *St. Luke: the Man and his Work.* 1919.
Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity.* Vol. II. 1922.
A. W. F. Blunt, *The Acts of the Apostles.* 1923.

Chapter III

J. O. F. Murray, *The Epistle to the Ephesians.* 1916.
E. F. Brown, *The Pastoral Epistles.* 1918.
Maurice Jones, *The Epistle to the Philippians.* 1918.
A. Plummer, *The First Epistle to the Thessalonians.* 1918.
A. Plummer, *The Epistle to the Philippians.* 1919.
D. Smith, *The Life and Letters of St. Paul.* 1919.
A. H. M'Neile, *St. Paul: his Life, Letters, and Christian Doctrine.* 1920.
A. E. Hillard, *The Pastoral Epistles.* 1920.
R. St. John Parry, *The Pastoral Epistles.* 1921.
E. D. W. Burton, *The Epistle to the Galatians.* 2 vols. 1921.
P. N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles.* 1921.
Maurice Jones, *The Epistle to the Colossians.* 1923.

Chapter IV

A. Nairne, *The Epistle of Priesthood.* 1914.
A. Nairne, *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* 1918.
E. F. Scott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* 1923.

Chapter V

J. H. Ropes, *The Epistle of St. James.* 1916.

Chapter VII

E. I. Robson, *Studies in the Second Epistle of St. Peter.* 1915.

Chapters VIII, IX, X, XI

On the Johannine Literature generally:

P. Gardner, *The Ephesian Gospel.* 1915.

A. Nairne, *The Johannine Writings.* 1919.

On the Fourth Gospel:

R. H. Strachan, *The Fourth Gospel: its Significance and Environment.* 1916.

H. L. Jackson, *The Problem of the Fourth Gospel.* 1918.

V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents.* Vol. III. 1918.

C. H. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel.* 1922.

H. Scott Holland, *The Fourth Gospel.* 1923.

On the Johannine Epistles:

C. Gore, *The Epistles of St. John.* 1920.

On the Apocalypse:

R. H. Charles, *Studies in the Apocalypse.* 1914.

I. T. Beckwith, *The Apocalypse of John.* 1920.

R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of St. John.* 2 vols. 1920.

A. S. Peake, *Revelation.* 1921.

P. E.-B. Allo, *Saint Jean, l'Apocalypse.* 1921.

CONTENTS

BOOK I

CHAPTER I

Introductory

	PAGE
The significance of the twentieth century in the history of religion	3-4
Three factors which have contributed to produce that effect	4-6
(*a*) Religion itself the centre of interest	4
Decline of interest in purely literary questions	4-5
Résumé of present-day literary criticism of the New Testament	5-6
(*b*) The results of modern research	6-8
1. Archaeological discoveries in Assyria, Babylonia. Their effect upon the criticism of the Old and New Testaments	7
2. The study of comparative religions, more especially the "Mystery cults" of Greece, Egypt, and the East	7-8
3. The discovery of inscriptions, papyri, and ostraka, and its influence upon our conceptions of New Testament Greek	8
4. The renewed study of Jewish apocalyptic literature in relation to the subject of eschatology	8
The importance of the "scientific-historical" method in dealing with the results of research	9-10
The weakness of modern German criticism	10
(*c*) The advance of psychology	10-12
1. The emphasis upon the "subliminal self"	11
2. Its employment in the sphere of theology	11-12

CHAPTER II

Christ in the Twentieth Century

Liberal Protestant Christology

	PAGE
Its principles and methods	13-15
These illustrated by citations from the writings of Harnack, Schmiedel, Weinel, Bousset, and Carpenter	15-20
The weaknesses of this type of Christology	21
Criticisms by Schweitzer and Figgis	21-22
The services rendered to the study of historical Christianity by the Liberal German School, more especially in the emphasis placed upon the real humanity of Jesus	22-23
The Liberal Protestant position challenged from three different directions, viz. by the "Jesus or Christ" controversy, the "Christ-Myth" theory, and the "Eschatological School"	23-24

CHAPTER III

Christ in the Twentieth Century (*contd.*)

"Jesus or Christ"

An attempt to postulate a cleavage between the Jesus of history and the Christ of worship	25-26
Origin of the controversy	26
The Rev. R. Roberts' position	26-28
The weakness of the contributions of the Liberal Protestant School	28-29
Criticisms of Mr Roberts' standpoint by Percy Gardner and Scott Holland	29-32
The significance of the early speeches in Acts with reference to the Christology of the primitive Church	32
Sanday's attempt to solve the problem of Christology on the lines of psychology	32-35
The "subliminal self" the seat of the Divine in Christ	33-34
The tentativeness of the theory	34
Criticisms by Garvie and Mackintosh	34-35

CHAPTER IV

Christ in the Twentieth Century (*contd.*)

"Jesus or Paul"

	PAGE
The importance of Paul's evidence as to the identity of Jesus with the Christ	36
Wrede's position—	
Paul transferred to the historical Jesus all his conceptions of a Divine celestial Being which he had while still a Pharisee	37-39
The cleavage between Jesus and Paul based on two grounds	40
1. Paul knew little or nothing of the details of the life of Jesus.	40
2. There is such an essential distinction between the teaching of Jesus and that of the Apostle that the latter cannot have been a disciple of the former in any real sense	40
Criticism of these statements	41-57
1. (*a*) Evidence of Paul's acquaintance with the facts of the life and ministry of Jesus	41-42
(*b*) Also with regard to the teaching of Jesus	42-43
(*c*) Knowledge of Jesus necessary to explain Paul's career as a persecutor and also as a missionary	43-44
J. Weiss' hypothesis that Paul must have known Jesus in the flesh	46-48
2. The distinction between the teaching of Jesus and that of Paul—	
(*a*) With regard to the Law	49-52
(*b*) With regard to the Person of Christ	52-58
(*a*) The differences not essential, and due to distinctions of experience between Jesus and Paul	49-50
(*b*) The antithesis between the purely human Jesus of the Synoptists and the pre-existent heavenly Christ of Paul exaggerated	52-53
It is explained by—	
1. The personal experience of Paul, and more especially by his conversion, His doctrine of the Law, Justification by faith, and the Person of Christ based on his conversion	53-56
2. The needs of the Apostolic Church at that period	56-57

PAGE

No evidence of any cleavage between Paul and the primitive Christian community in the matter of the doctrine of the Person of Christ 57-58
Alleged Pauline influences in St. Mark's Gospel . . 58
The New Testament a self-consistent unity . . . 59

CHAPTER V

Christ in the Twentieth Century (*contd.*)

The "Christ-Myth"

The "semi-mythical" school 60-61
Some representatives — Conybeare, Pfleiderer, Loisy, G. Tyrrell, K. Anderson 61-64
The "Christ-Myth" theory 64-65
Jensen's hypothesis. The larger part of Christ's history and some of His teaching traceable to an Israelitish form of the "Gilgamesh Epic" 65-67
Criticism of this hypothesis 67-68
Kalthoff's hypothesis—
The origin of Christianity explained purely on the lines of social and economic motives, and not with reference to the historic personality of Jesus. The Jesus of the Gospels is simply the consciousness of the Christian community objectified and personified . . . 68-69
J. M. Robertson—
A synopsis of his ideas. Jesus a personification of Joshua, an ancient Semitic deity. Not historically connected with Nazareth. The Sonship of Christ, the Passion story, the Sacraments, all explained with reference to contemporary religious cults 69-72
The Gospel narrative of the Passion only the reproduction of a "Mystery Play" 72-73
The dependence of Christianity upon Mithra . . 73-75
Criticism of the above 75-76
Drews' theory—
Reproduces Robertson's ideas closely . . . 76-78
His treatment of Paul's evidence 78-80
The teaching of Christ not original 80-81
Summary of his position 81-83
Strength of the evidence for the historic Jesus. . . 83-85
Margoliouth's criticism of Robertson 85
Weak points in the theory 85-86
Two cautions 86

CHAPTER VI

Christ in the Twentieth Century (*contd.*)

The Christ of Eschatology

	PAGE
Apocalyptic literature	87-91
The importance of eschatology	87
Results of the renewed study of Jewish apocalyptic literature	88
Survey of this literature	88-90
The motive of apocalyptic	90-91
Pre-Christian eschatology	91-101
This concerned with (1) The Kingdom of God, Judgment, and Resurrection	91
(2) The Messiah	92
Sketch of the development of the doctrine of the Kingdom of God	92-95
(*a*) In the pre-prophetic period	92
(*b*) In the pre-exilic period	92-93
(*c*) In the exilic and post-exilic period	93-94
(*d*) In the apocalyptic period	94-95
The development of the doctrine of the Messiah	95-100
The Messiah as King	96
The Levitic Messiah	96-97
The Warrior Prince	97
The Servant of the Lord	97-98
The Son of Man	98-99
The Elijah conception	99-100
The eschatology of the Gospels	101-119
The theory of the strict eschatological school	101-103
The eschatological element in the Gospels	103-107
The eschatological environment of Jesus	103
The eschatological sayings of Jesus	103-105
Teaching concerning the Kingdom of God which is not eschatological. The Kingdom of God a present reality	105-107
Is the teaching of Christ an "Interimsethik"?	107-108
Arguments to the contrary	108-111
Christ's conception of His Messiahship	112-117
The Warrior Prince	112
The Son of Man	112-115
Judge of quick and dead	115
The anointed Son of God	115-116
The suffering Servant of the Lord	116-117
Was Christ misled in His eschatological predictions?	117-119
Some suggestions as to the manner in which these have been and are being fulfilled	118-119

CHAPTER VII

St. Paul and the Mystery Religions

	PAGE
The importance of the study of Comparative Religions with reference to the background and environment of Christianity	120
Some prominent workers in this field	121
Influence of this research upon recent conceptions of Christianity	121-122
A survey of the religions of the Graeco-Roman world at the beginning of the Christian era, including brief descriptions of Stoicism, Orphism, Mysteries of Eleusis, Cults of Cybele and Atis, Serapis, Isis, and Osiris, Mithra, and the Hermetic literature	122-130
The general character of these cults	130-132
The relation of the Mystery Religions to Christianity	132-160
Works dealing with the subject	133
Some characteristic opinions with reference to the influence of the Mystery Religions upon Pauline Christianity. Heitmüller, K. Lake, P. Gardner, Loisy, Pfleiderer, Conybeare, Schweitzer, Clemen, and Kennedy	133-136
Some general objections to the theory of postulating any really effective influence of the Mystery Religions upon Pauline Christianity	137-139
These assumptions examined with reference to—	
St. Paul's mysticism	139-140
Pauline terminology	140-142
Paul's conception of salvation and sacraments	142-143
The relationship of the Mystery Religion conceptions to Paul's central doctrines of redemption and salvation	143-157
The relation between Christ and the "Redeemer-God" of the Mystery Religions	143-144
The Pauline doctrine of salvation compared with the Mystery Religion doctrine of regeneration through communion with the Deity	144-147
The Pauline sacraments and their relationship to the Mystery Religions	147-157
1. Baptism. Baptism for the dead	147-152
2. The Lord's Supper	152-157
Sacramental meals in the Mystery Religions	152-154
Compared with Christian sacraments	154-157
Summary—	
Influences which played their part in the development of Paul's thought and teaching	157-161
1. The Old Testament, but in the Greek version	157-158

PAGE

2. Greek philosophy, more especially Stoicism . . 158
3. Mystery Religions, but their influence confined to the use of terminology and ideas which would be familiar to his converts. 158-159
4. Mysticism derived from the Old Testament and Judaistic sources 159-160

Sacramental teaching not based on Mystery Religion conceptions 160
The significance of the Cross in Pauline thought . . 161

CHAPTER VIII

The Language of the New Testament

Nineteenth-century theory of New Testament Greek . . 162-164
Revolutionised by recent discoveries 164-165
Quantity and variety of the material 165-166
Inscriptions, papyri, ostraka 166-167
Importance of Deissmann's labours on non-literary Hellenistic Greek 167-169
Specimen letters from his volumes 169-171
Illustrating the daily life of the humbler classes and modifying the usual view as to heathen morals . . . 171-174
Bearing of these discoveries on New Testament Greek . 174-185
Reduction in the number of "Biblical" New Testament words and phrases 175-177
Illustrations of social and religious history . . . 177-179
Parallels between the Pauline letters and the papyri . 179-181
New light thrown on our estimate of the New Testament books as literature 181-185
Some of Deissmann's extreme conclusions criticised . . 185-186

BOOK II

CHAPTER I

The Synoptic Problem

The achievements of recent criticism 189
Points in regard to which a considerable degree of agreement has been reached 189-190

PAGE

Literature dealing with the problem 190-191
The oral hypothesis 191-193
The basal documents Greek and not Aramaic . . . 193-194
The Marcan document 194-207
The priority of St. Mark generally accepted . . . 194-195
Did the authors of our First and Third Gospels use our St. Mark or another document virtually identical with it? 195-204
Solutions—
1. The Ur-Marcus theory 196-198
2. Three editions of the Second Gospel . . . 198-201
3. Sanday's solution 201-204
The omission by St. Luke of St. Mark vi. 45–viii. 46 . 204-206
Wendling's theory of the composition of St. Mark . . 206-207
The Logian document or Q 207-219
Reconstructions of Q 208-211
Which of the Gospels, St. Matthew or St. Luke, has preserved Q with the greater degree of accuracy? . . . 212-213
Did Matthew and Luke use the same version of Q? . 213-214
Did Q contain a narrative of the Passion? . . . 214-217
Was Mark acquainted with Q, and did he use it? . . 217-219
Luke's special sources 219-222
Matter peculiar to St. Luke 219-220
New theories as to Luke's non-Marcan source—
Stanton's and Bartlet's theory 220-221
Holdsworth's hypothesis 221-222
The literary evolution of the Gospels 223-226

CHAPTER II

The Acts of the Apostles

Its position enhanced by recent criticism . . . 227-229
Ramsay's work with reference to it 229-230
Harnack's contribution to the criticism of the Acts . . 230-233
Miss Stawell's theory as to Luke's nationality . . . 233-235
Sources of Acts 235-242
Did Luke make use of the Pauline Epistles? . . 236-237
Harnack's source theory 238-240
Ramsay's source theory 240-242
Difficulties with reference to the historicity of Acts . . 242-254
1. Relation of Acts to Galatians 242-252
The Apostolic Decrees in Acts xv. . . . 243-247
The date of Galatians 247-252

PAGE

A pre-conciliar date postulated 247-248
This not established 249-252
2. Paul's relationship to Judaism and Jewish Christianity 252-254
Moffatt's explanation of the differences between the Acts and the Pauline Epistles 252-253
Harnack on the Jewish element in Paul . . . 253-254
The date of Acts 254-260
Harnack's arguments in favour of a date previous to Paul's death 254-258
Criticism of Harnack's position 258-260

CHAPTER III

The Epistles of St. Paul

Their position in recent criticism 261-264
The authenticity of 2 Thessalonians 264-270
Objections. 265-267
Wrede's theory 267-268
Harnack's solution 268-269
Pauline authorship defended 269-270
The authenticity of Ephesians 271-276
Objections, based on 271-273
Its literary affinities 271
Its language 271-273
The changed position of parties in the Church . . 273
The position assigned to Christ and to the Church in the Epistle 273
The case for the Pauline authorship 274-276
The above objections considered 275-276
Pauline authorship still tenable 276
The authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles . . . 276-291
Points of agreement among all critics. . . . 277
Arguments against the authenticity, based on . . 277-280
Their language and style 278
Church government and organisation . . . 278
Heresies. 278
The Christian doctrine 279
The difficulty of fitting the letters into any authentic scheme of events of Paul's life 279
The case for the Pauline authorship 280-291
The external evidence 280-281
The internal evidence 281-283
The prevalence of proper names 281
The characters of Timothy and Titus . . . 281-283

PAGE

The chronological difficulty 283
Vernon Bartlet's solution 283-286
The vocabulary of the Epistles 286-287
Heresies and Church organisation 290
Summary 291
The use of an amanuensis and shorthand, and their influence upon vocabulary and style 287-290
Pseudonimity in connection with early Christian literature . 291-292
Conclusion 293

CHAPTER IV

Non-Pauline Epistles

The Epistle to the Hebrews

Results of recent criticism. 294-295
Character and style 295-297
Author 297-305
Suggested authors — Barnabas, Luke, Apollos, Philip, Prisca and Aquila, Aristion 298-304
Summary 304-305
Destination and purpose of the Epistle 305-311
Traditional opinion abandoned. 306
Question of Jewish or Gentile readers considered . . 306-308
Former alternative favoured 309
Addressed to a "House-Church" at Rome . . . 309-311
Date of the Epistle 311-312

CHAPTER V

Non-Pauline Epistles (*contd.*)

The Epistle of St. James

Character of recent criticism 313-315
The title 315
The readers 315-316
Ecclesiastical organisation 316
The author 316-317
Special features 317
Literary relationships 317-318
External history 318
The situation as reconstructed by Mayor . . . 318-321
The author 319

PAGE

The readers 319-320
Its priority to the Pauline writings 320
The absence of distinctive Christian doctrine explained .. 320-321
The date of the Epistle 321-326
A date between A.D. 40 and 50 321
A date about A.D. 62 321-322
A date between A.D. 70 and 95 322-323
A date in the second century 323-325
Criticism of these hypotheses 323-325
Choice lies between the earliest and latest dates . . 323-324
Difficulties of the traditional theory . . . 325
Spitta's theory of its date and character . . . 326
Moulton's theory of its date and character . . . 326-327

CHAPTER VI

NON-PAULINE EPISTLES (*contd.*)

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

The readers 328-329
The author 329-338
Arguments for the Petrine authorship . . . 330-331
Objections, based on—
The character of the persecution described . . 331-335
The Pauline tone of the Epistle 335-337
Its language and style 337-338
The objections considered—
The persecution 332-335
Three periods suggested—
Under Trajan 332
Under Nero 332-334
Under Domitian 334-335
Second period most probable 335
The connection of Silvanus with the Epistle . . 338-339
The pseudonymous theory 339-340
Harnack's theory 340-341
Summary 341-342

CHAPTER VII

NON-PAULINE EPISTLES (*contd.*)

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE AND THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

The relationship between the two Epistles . . . 343-345
The dependence of 2 St. Peter on St. Jude established . 345

The Epistle of St. Jude

	PAGE
The author	345-346
Its external history	346
Its vocabulary and style	346-347
The date of the Epistle	347-349
Three hypotheses—	
1. A.D. 100–125	347-348
2. A.D. 65–70	348
3. About A.D. 80	348-349
The third date preferable	349
The occasion and destination of the Epistle	349-350

The Second Epistle of St. Peter

The author	350-355
The conservative standpoint	350-351
The Petrine authorship not established	351-352
Its pseudonymous origin	352
Arguments in favour of	352-355
Its relationship to 1 St. Peter	353-354
Its external history and literary affinities	354
Marks of time furnished by the Epistle	354-355
Internal evidence	355
Its date, occasion, and destination	355-357

CHAPTER VIII

The Johannine Literature

The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel

Importance of the subject	359-360
The traditional view	360-361
Statement of the problem	361-363
Arguments for the Johannine authorship	363-374
1. External evidence	363-369
Iem. Rom., Ignatius and Polycarp, *Didache*, Epistle of Barnabas, *Shepherd of Hermas*, Papias, Justin Martyr—	
The character and significance of the evidence	369-370
The problem: How to explain the sudden emergence of the Gospel from the twilight of A.D. 100–150 to the clear day of A.D. 170 and downwards	370-371

PAGE

2. Internal evidence 371-374
Explicit statement of authorship in the Gospel . 371
Indirect references to the author . . . 371-372
The "pragmatism" of the Gospel 372-373
It describes the Judaism of the period before, and not after, the destruction of Jerusalem . . 373-374
The non-Johannine position 374-386
Literature antagonistic to the Johannine authorship . 375
External evidence 375-379
1. The argument from silence 375-377
The tradition that the Gospel was written by St. John at Ephesus disproved by the silence of—
(*a*) Certain New Testament documents 375-376
(*b*) Documents of the sub-Apostolic age—Clem. Rom., Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias—as to any residence of St. John at Ephesus 376-377
2. Positive evidence 377-379
Statement of Papias, quoted by Georgius Hamartolus and Philip of Side, that St. John was martyred with his brother St. James . . 378
Evidence of calendars and martyrologies . . 378-379
Evidence of Heracleon 379
Bacon's theory 379-386
1. The external evidence 380
2. The origin and growth of the Johannine tradition . 380-382
3. Early opposition to the Gospel 382-385
4. Internal evidence 385-386
Moffatt's position 386
The Odes of Solomon and their significance in regard to the date of the Gospel 387
Summary and conclusion 388-389

CHAPTER IX

The Johannine Literature (*contd.*)

The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel

Not necessarily dependent upon the question of authorship 390-391
The contrast between the Synoptic record and that of St. John 391-393
The problem and its solution 393-397
Two methods prevalent 394-395
1. The traditional method which regards both the Synoptic and Johannine records as historic . 394
2. The advanced theory that the Gospel is theology and not history, poetry and not prose. . . 395-396

PAGE

3. A third solution suggested, a compromise between the two preceding methods 396-397
The character and purpose of the Gospel . . . 397-402
1. The conditions under which the Gospel was written . 397-399
(*a*) Written in an age of transition from the Apostolic to the sub-Apostolic age 398-399
(*b*) In an age of transition to a different culture . 399
(*c*) Christianity could no longer continue as a religion based upon mere outward knowledge of Christ in the flesh 399
How these conditions have affected the character of the Gospel 400-402
1. It shows signs of development of the Christian message during the first century of its history . . 400
2. The Synoptic idea is replaced by the Logos conception 401
3. A twofold danger guarded against in the Gospel . 401-402
(*a*) That Christianity might evaporate into a philosophy.
(*b*) That it might petrify into a mechanical tradition.
The relationship of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptists . 402-412
1. The coincidences 403-404
2. The additions to the Synoptists in the Gospel . . 404-406
3. The omissions in the Gospel of material found in the Synoptists 406-407
4. The discourses in the Fourth Gospel . . . 407-411
5. Points in which the Gospel definitely disagrees with the Synoptists 411-412
Some points of real difficulty 412-417
1. Polemical elements 412-415
(*a*) The controversy with the Jews . . . 413
(*b*) The attitude of the Gospel towards the Baptist . 413-414
(*c*) Against certain forms of Gnosticism . . 414-415
2. Three incidents of doubtful historicity . . . 415-417
(*a*) The cleansing of the Temple . . . 415-416
(*b*) The place of the Eucharistic teaching . . 416-417
(*c*) The story of the raising of Lazarus . . . 417
Summary 418-420

CHAPTER X

The Johannine Literature (*contd.*)

The Epistles of St. John

The First Epistle of St. John

Form and character of the writing 421-422
Relationship to the Fourth Gospel 422-423

PAGE

The case for their common authorship 423-424
Objections to this 424-425
The priority of the Gospel. 425-426
The date and destination of the Epistle. . . . 426
Heresies combated in the Epistle 426-428

THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN

Authorship 428-429
Destination of the Second Epistle 429-431
Meaning of the phrase "elect lady" 430
The relationship of the Second Epistle to the Third . . 431-432
The historical situation implied in the Epistles . . 432-434
Chapman's and Bartlet's conjectures 432
Harnack's theory 433-434
This criticised 434

CHAPTER XI

THE JOHANNINE LITERATURE (*contd.*)

THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN

Factors which have contributed to the elucidation of the book 435-436
Its unity 436-444
Some source-analysis schemes 437-438
Gunkel's theory 438-439
Bacon's theory 439-440
This criticised 440-441
Tendency of present-day criticism 441-442
The recognition of some interpolations . . . 442
Swete's standpoint 442-444
The date 444-447
The traditional theory 444
Nineteenth-century standpoint 444-446
Recent conclusions 446-447
Reinach's hypothesis 447
The authorship 447-453
Its relation to the Fourth Gospel 448-453
Language and style 448-450
Hort's explanation of the linguistic difficulties . . 450
Zahn's explanation of the linguistic difficulties . . 450
Christological and eschatological differences . . 451
Was the Apocalypse written by St. John the Apostle? . 451-453
Failing St. John, who was the author? . . . 453

PAGE

The interpretation of the book 453-455
Roman Catholic methods 454
The contemporary-historical method 454-455
The book a true prophecy 455

GENERAL INDEX 457

INDEX OF AUTHORS (MODERN) 465

BOOK I

THE CHRIST OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE CHRIST OF TO-DAY

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

The beginning of a century does not necessarily presuppose the commencement of a new era in any department save that of time, and it may mean nothing more than a conventional halting-place on the march of the ages. The dawn of the twentieth century has, however, proved to be considerably more than a conventional epoch, and there stand to its credit several new departures of the most momentous significance in the history of many movements, religious, social, philosophical, and scientific. In no sphere of life and learning has the coincidence of the birth of a new century with a fresh development been more marked than in that which is associated with the history of religion in general, and with that of the Christian religion in particular. In the study of the essence and history of Christianity the New Testament must ever hold a leading place, and it will generally be found that any material change in our outlook upon Christianity as a whole is very largely determined by a preceding change in our attitude towards the New Testament. Now in some respects the New Testament is passing through an epoch of a most critical character, the ultimate effect of which it is not easy to forecast. We are face to face with a

situation which is the outcome of a variety of causes, every one of which has an importance of its own, and all of which combined may lead to a considerable modification of our ideas as to the character and content of the literature of the Apostolic Age. The present volume is an attempt to set forth some of the leading features connected with the study of religion as a whole which tend to influence our attitude towards the New Testament which must, as a necessary consequence, cause the early years of the twentieth century to leave a very decided mark upon the study of the Christian religion.

(*a*) *First*, and perhaps the most important, of all these factors is that *religion* itself has become the centre of interest rather than the documents, texts, and manuscripts in which the doctrines and history of that religion lie embedded. In this respect the first decade of the twentieth century presents a very marked contrast to the nineteenth century as a whole. The most characteristic element in the New Testament criticism of the last century was the "Battle of the Books," and its main purpose has been aptly described by Professor Saintsbury in his comment upon nineteenth-century literary criticism as a whole. "It has been the mission of the nineteenth century to prove that everybody's work was written by some one else, and it will not be the most useless task of the twentieth to betake itself to more profitable inquiries." In the domain of Christian literature everything points to the fact that Professor Saintsbury's wise counsel is being taken seriously to heart. Controversies concerning the authorship and authenticity of the books of the New Testament are no longer of primary interest. The theories of the famous Tübingen

school, which relegated a considerable portion of the New Testament to the middle of the second century, now command but scanty respect at the hands of sober criticism, and it is not too much to say that every New Testament document, with the possible exception of the Fourth Gospel and the Second Epistle of St. Peter, may be placed well within the first century. Of the Pauline letters the four "pillar" Epistles of Baur have now increased to nine, while some doubt still remains as to the authorship of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and a stronger measure of doubt with regard to the Pastoral Epistles. The Synoptic Gospels are generally acknowledged to have reached their present form before the year 80 A.D., and, if Harnack's latest conclusions on the subject are to be accepted, all three Gospels may well have been written before 65 A.D. In any case interest no longer centres so much upon their authenticity and dates as upon their mutual relation to each other. The Lucan authorship of the Acts and the position of the book as a historical document of high rank are also slowly working their way into favour, a result that is mainly due to the labours of Dr. Harnack and of Sir William Ramsay.

Criticism may thus be said to have brought about a fairly general settlement of the questions of authorship, authenticity, and dates as they affect the New Testament, and this consensus of opinion is not likely to be seriously modified in the near future. The interests of the religious and critical world have now been transferred from what one may call the "accidentals," the mere surroundings of the books, to the books themselves and to their interpretation. The pertinent enquiry is no longer "Who wrote the books, and when were they written?" but "What

do the books contain, and what is the true meaning of that content?" The present age is essentially concerned with ideas, and with the problem of personality possibly even more than with ideas. "Personality" may in truth be described as the key to the religious spirit of the age. In the matter, therefore, of the interpretation of the New Testament it is the question of "personality" as revealed in Jesus Christ that is of supreme significance. The "storm centre" of twentieth-century criticism is no longer the books of the New Testament as such, but the Person of Christ as represented and taught in the books. In this respect the twentieth century bids fair to rival the fourth century of our era, hitherto the classic period of Christological controversy.

(*b*) *Second* among the elements which closely affect our outlook upon the New Testament and upon Christianity generally must be placed the results of modern research in the realms of comparative religion and archaeology. The last decade of the nineteenth century and the first of the twentieth have brought to light a perfect wealth of new material which is of incomparable value in connection with the study of Christian origins and of the background of the New Testament. Our knowledge of the civilisations and religions which either preceded Christianity or were contemporary with it has been extended beyond measure. The great historic religions of the mighty East, of ancient Babylon and Persia; the mystery cults of Western Asia, Egypt, and Greece; and Judaism, as it existed in the centuries after the close of the Old Testament canon, now rise into view with a clearness that was quite beyond our reach previous to the acquisition of this additional material.

The knowledge placed at our disposal by the results of recent research and discoveries has made itself felt in four different directions :

1. The extensive archaeological discoveries among the ruins of the ancient empires of Assyria and Babylon have given rise to the " Pan-Babylonian School," with which are connected the names of Winckler, Zimmern, Jeremias, Gunkel, and Jensen. The interest of this movement, although more directly connected with the Old Testament, is by no means confined to it, and it is freely asserted by its adherents that not only the greater part of the Old Testament, but a considerable portion of the New, reveals clear traces of the influence of Babylonian mythology, and that many of its more characteristic features are little more than forms of the Babylonian myths of Marduk, Tammuz, and Gilgamesh.

2. The study of the " mystery cults " of Greece, Egypt, and more especially of the type of religion which, originating in the East, flooded the Graeco-Roman world during the early days of the Empire, has in recent years been considerably advanced by the industry of many scholars of repute. Dr. Farnell and Miss J. Harrison have done most valuable work in their studies of the Greek religions, while to Dr. Dill and Mr. T. R. Glover we owe much for their enquiries into the influence and diffusion of the Oriental cults in the provinces of the Empire. The researches of Continental scholars like Reitzenstein, Cumont, Wendland, and Dieterich in connection with the " mystery religions " enable us to realise, in a way that was quite impossible before, something of the real history and true character of these cults.

3. The abundance of new material recently brought to light in the shape of Hellenistic inscriptions and Egyptian papyri and ostraka has proved perfectly invaluable in connection with the history and development of the Greek language in the Graeco-Roman world. The masterly treatment of this abundant material by Dr. Deissmann has emphasised its importance not only in connection with the history of Greek as a whole, but has also helped us to realise its unique significance with respect to the language of the New Testament, with the result that our traditional conceptions of the character of New Testament Greek are being rapidly revolutionised.

4. Not the least important of the efforts of recent research has been the renewed study of the large mass of Judaistic literature of the centuries immediately preceding and following the birth of Christianity, and more particularly of that section of it which is apocalyptic in character. In this department of semi-Biblical study Schürer and Bousset have rendered excellent service, but the most prominent and successful worker in this field is Dr. R. H. Charles of Oxford, whose editions of the various apocalyptic documents are quite indispensable.

The influence of Babylonian mythology, Oriental Mystery Religions and Judaistic apocalyptic, upon the Gospel of Christ as revealed in the New Testament will receive more detailed treatment in the later chapters, which deal with the "Christ-Myth theory," "St. Paul and the Mystery Religions," and "The Christ of Eschatology," respectively, and for a full discussion of the effect of the recent unearthing of Egyptian papyri and ostraka, the reader is referred to the chapter on "The Language of the New Testa-

ment." This considerable acquisition of new material of the most relevant character must, in any case, have been followed by important developments, but its value for the purposes of our study has been enhanced by the application to it of the "scientific-historical" method which has proved so fruitful in other branches of learning. Without in any way accepting the more extreme conclusions of the students of Comparative Religions it is an undoubted advantage to be placed in a position where Christianity can be considered in relation to its environment, as one historical religion among many. We are thus enabled to see how it takes its place in the stream of the religious history of the world, and, without prejudice to its Divine origin and spiritual uniqueness, we can study its connection with the other religions which surrounded it and with which for many centuries it had to wage a strenuous battle.

The extension of the "scientific-historical" method to the New Testament itself has been equally momentous in its results. The method of New Testament exegesis which confined itself to the consideration of its relationship with the Old Testament only has become obsolete, and it is becoming more clearly understood every day that just as the Christian religion is historically one among many, so the New Testament must also be studied in relation to all relevant literature. Influences of the most divers characters, and from manifold directions, have had their share in the moulding of it. The literatures of Babylon, Persia, Greece, Egypt, and Western Asia have contributed their quota, as well as Jewish literature, canonical and non-canonical. It is also necessary to bear in mind that the influence of non-

Jewish literatures upon the New Testament has been exercised directly, and also indirectly, through the medium of Judaism, which had been permeated by foreign elements, Babylonian, Persian, and Hellenistic, for centuries before the Christian era.

Before concluding this section it is necessary at the very outset to utter a word of caution with regard to some of the more extreme theories of modern criticism as to the influence of foreign elements upon the New Testament and upon the Gospel of Christ. It appears to be a weakness common to many, if not most, of the German scholars of the present day not to be able to see beyond the immediate circle covered by their own particular theory. Thus, to take a very significant instance, Jensen seeks to explain everything in heaven and earth by means of his "Gilgamesh-Epic" theory. Schweitzer again is so carried away by his enthusiasm for his "Eschatological" idea that everything must be made to fit it, and both Christ and St. Paul are to be interpreted solely on the lines of eschatology. Deissmann shows the same tendency but in a lesser degree, and is somewhat inclined to attach greater significance to the effect of the recently discovered papyri and ostraka upon the question of the language and literature of the New Testament than is altogether warranted by the facts.

(*c*) *A third factor* which has had a material effect upon the position held by the New Testament in modern thought is the remarkable advance made by the science of psychology.

The last twenty years have witnessed a considerable extension in the field of its operations, and its most signal achievement is the growing emphasis

upon the conception of the "subliminal self," originally associated with the name of the late F. W. H. Myers. It may be well to quote Mr. Myers' own description of this new and striking feature in the realm of psychology. "The conscious self of each of us, as we call it, the empirical, supraliminal self, as I should prefer to say, does not comprise the whole of the consciousness or the faculty within us. There exists a more comprehensive consciousness, a profounder faculty, which for the most part remains potential only as far as regards the life of earth, but from which the consciousness and the faculty of earth life are mere selections, and which reasserts itself in its plenitude after the liberating change of death. I propose to extend the meaning of the word 'subliminal' so as to make it cover all that takes place beneath the ordinary threshold, or outside the ordinary margin of consciousness—not only those faint stimulations whose very faintness keeps them submerged, but much also which psychology as yet scarcely recognises, sensations, thoughts, emotions, which may be strong, definite, and independent, but which by the original constitution of our being seldom emerge into that supraliminal current of consciousness which we habitually identify with ourselves. I find it permissible and convenient to speak of a subliminal self. There may be not only co-operation between these quasi-independent trains of thought, but upheavals and alternations of personality of many kinds, so that what was once below the surface may for a time, or permanently, rise above it." [1]

This question of subliminal activities would seem destined to play a most important and valuable part

[1] Myers, *Human Personality*, pp. 13-15.

not only in the future of psychology itself, but in that of theology as well. Dr. Sanday's suggestion that the relation between the human and divine in the consciousness of our Lord may be interpreted by means of this theory of the " subliminal self," of which we shall have more to say in a later chapter, is a significant illustration of the coming importance of psychological conceptions in the realm of Christology. The value of psychology in the province of religion is, however, not confined to the single issue already referred to, for the science is now extensively applied to the interpretation of religious experience. The researches of students of comparative religions have supplied an abundant store of materials in the form of beliefs, rituals, and institutions of numberless religions and cults, and these have been correlated and classified, so that a psychological study of religion is now an accomplished fact. The most interesting achievement in this direction is that of the late Professor William James, who, in his work entitled *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, utilised psychology to explain the phenomena of conversion.

The shifting of interest from questions of authorship and dates to the problem of the interpretation of the New Testament, with the consequent emphasis upon " personality," the acquisition of a rich store of new material with its effect upon the study of comparative religions, and the application of the science of psychology in the fields of religion and theology are thus three new and significant factors to which we may attribute the unique importance of the early years of the twentieth century in the history of the study of the New Testament and of Christianity as a whole.

CHAPTER II

CHRIST IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

LIBERAL PROTESTANT CHRISTOLOGY

LITERATURE FOR CHAPTERS II. AND III.

Harnack, *What is Christianity?* 1903. E.T.
J. Estlin Carpenter, *The First Three Gospels* 1904.
The Historical Jesus and the Theological Christ. 1910.
Bousset, *Jesus.* 1906. E.T.
Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research.* 1907.
Christology and Personality. 1911.
Jesus or Christ. Hibbert Journal Supplement. 1909.
J. Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel.* 1909.
Neville Figgis, *Civilisation at the Cross-Roads.* 1912.
Mackintosh, *The Person of Christ.* 1912.
Schmiedel, Articles in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica.* 1899–1907.

THE tendency of twentieth-century religious thought to concentrate its attention upon the Person of Christ has already been referred to, and no attempt to set forth the present condition of New Testament study would be adequate which did not contain a somewhat detailed account of the various Christological theories or systems which are now struggling for recognition.

The history of twentieth-century Christology is bound up with that of the Liberal Protestant School, and more particularly with the German section of it. This type of religious and critical thought has been dominant in Germany during the latter half of the last century and numbered among its adherents most of the best known Continental scholars of that

period, such as Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, Wellhausen, Schmidt, and Keim. The school still preserves a vigorous existence, and among its later representatives we may mention Harnack, Schmiedel, Bousset, Jülicher, and von Soden. The principal claim of the school is that its work is entirely based on scientific principles, and that it has been the first to apply the scientific historical method to the study of religion. Science is the acknowledged ground of their outlook and not the Church of Christ. In their treatment of the New Testament as evidence for the life and Person of Christ they exhibit a strong tendency to confine themselves within the limits of the Synoptic Gospels, and not the Synoptic Gospels as a whole, but only those sections of the books the sources and origins of which they consider unquestionable. Their conception of the Person of Christ is then based on the slender evidence concerning the self-consciousness of Jesus furnished by these very much reduced and meagre materials. This sectional use of the New Testament is supported by the plea that the other documents treat of Christ as God. This additional evidence is therefore ruled out of court by the prepossessions of these scholars, and the Godhead of Christ is deliberately placed on one side as not being capable of proof or interpretation on scientific principles. The result of this method as concerning Christ and Christianity as a whole is to relegate both to the position of one of a class. Thus the absoluteness of Christ for the life of religion is challenged, and He comes to be included under a general notion, as one of a series, the greatest religious "genius" or "hero of history" far above all other men, and in virtue of His life and Message truly our

Lord and Master, but yet only one among many. The religion of the New Testament again is treated as only one phenomenon by the side of others in the general history of religion, the purest and highest form to which religion has yet attained, but differing only quantitatively and not qualitatively from other systems.

We shall best arrive at a true conception of the Christological views of this school by giving a short *résumé* of the opinions of some of the more prominent of its representatives.

HARNACK.—We will begin with the greatest of them all, Harnack, whose name, whatever judgment we may pronounce on his Christology, will command general respect and admiration in virtue of his marvellous industry and of the invaluable services he has rendered to the study of Christianity on its historical and documentary sides. Taking his well-known work *What is Christianity?* as our guide, his general conception of the Person of Christ may thus be summarised.

1. *Documentary Evidence.*—Beginning with the question of evidence he accepts the Synoptic Gospels as being on the whole trustworthy historical records (21).[1] His attitude towards miracles is not very clearly defined. The miracles of healing he considers to be capable of explanation as instances of the influence of soul upon body and of soul upon soul. While keeping a fairly open mind on the question his bias is perhaps on the whole against the miraculous element in the Gospels (24-30). The teaching of Christ in the Gospels can be included within three circles of ideas: "The Kingdom of God and His

[1] The figures in brackets refer to the pages of *What is Christianity?* E.T.

coming," " God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul," " The higher righteousness, and the commandment of love " (51).

2. *His conception of the Person of Christ* may be gathered from the following quotations.

(*a*) *The Claims of Christ upon His Followers.*—" He desired no other belief in His Person and no other attachment to it than is contained in the keeping of His commandments " (125).

(*b*) *His Relation to God.*—" In all things He is dependent on and submissive to God, and over against God even includes Himself among other men." " The Gospel as Jesus proclaimed it has to do with the Father only and not with the Son . . . and yet He is the Way to the Father, and as He is the appointed of the Father He is the Judge as well " (144-145).

(*c*) *His Mission to the World.*—" He is convinced that He knows God in a way in which no one ever knew Him before, and He knows that it is His vocation to communicate this knowledge of God to others by word and deed, and with it the knowledge that men are God's children " (128).

(*d*) *His Messianic Claims.*—Christ's use of the title " the Son of Man " is acknowledged to be sufficient evidence that He claimed to be the Messiah (144).

(*e*) *His Death.*—Christ's own description of His death is as a service rendered *to* many (160).

(*f*) *His Resurrection.*—Harnack is doubtful of the trustworthiness of the records of the post-resurrection appearances, but he goes on to assert that " it is certain that the grave of Jesus was the birthplace of the indestructible belief that death is vanquished, that there is a life eternal " (162).

There is much in this summary which makes a strong appeal. We gladly recognise the emphasis upon the moral and religious uniqueness of Jesus, and upon the value of His mediation between God and man by His revelation of God to man and the drawing of man to God. Equally prominent is the desire to do full justice to the moral and religious content of the Gospel. But a mere glance at his conception of the Person of Christ is sufficient to reveal the chasm that separates even Harnack from the full and complete faith of the Catholic Church. There is no Godhead of Christ in any real sense, and in Harnack's mind it means no more than the Divine element that is revealed in the uniqueness of His humanity. There is no atonement or redemption by His death and no absolute claim on Christ's part on the love, worship, and homage of man as his supreme Lord and Master.

SCHMIEDEL.—We next come to Schmiedel, best known in England by his famous article on the "Gospels" in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.

His position may be determined by the following summary of his opinions as expressed in several of his publications. First of all we note a serious declension in his Christology from the standard set by Harnack. The Divinity of Christ is curtly dismissed on the ground that the union of the Divine nature and human nature in Jesus is impossible, and as Jesus was undoubtedly man He could not be God at the same time. He further maintains that the demand that men should embrace the idea of a perfect God and a perfect man as united in the person of a Saviour does violence to the thought and experience of God-fearing people.

The Jesus of Schmiedel's conception is not sinless, should not be spoken of as the "Son of God" but as a "child of God," and our right attitude towards Him is not that of worship but of reverence. The supreme gift of the forgiveness of sins through God was not effected but only revealed by Him. Nothing, however, gives us such a clear idea of his attitude towards Christ as the form of prayer he suggests as suitable, and which he expresses in the following terms[1]: "Be thou my guiding star; let thy image stand ever before mine eyes; rule my heart; make me thy disciple." After this it is difficult to understand his claim that this fallible human Jesus, to whom this prayer is addressed, is yet the founder of a perfect religion.

Schmiedel's criticism of the Gospels is extremely drastic and far-reaching and has aroused the bitterest opposition in some quarters, but in fairness to him it should be stated that the charge brought against him that, in the article on the Gospels previously referred to, he reduced the authentic sayings of Jesus to nine is based on a misunderstanding. He has himself explained that the "nine foundation pillars" he set up for a genuinely scientific life of Jesus were not meant to include the whole of what he regards as credible in that life. They merely form the "ground plan" of what is credible, and everything which agrees with the image of Jesus as founded on the "pillars" and does not otherwise lie open to objection, is worthy of belief. At the same time his canon of criticism that one can only accept as authentic such sayings of Jesus as appear to contradict the distinctively Christian conception of Him and, there-

[1] See Schmiedel's essay in *Jesus or Christ. Hibbert Journal* Supplement.

fore, cannot have been invented by later Christian writers who held that view of His Person, reduces the value of this explanation to very small dimensions.

WEINEL.—Another well-known exponent of similar ideas is Professor Weinel of Jena. His standpoint is well defined in the following sentence: "From the Gospels we must seek the human being—a man filled with love and benevolence, with grandeur and holy indignation, with purity and tenderness, with bitter scorn for all mean actions and selfishness. This man we find everywhere." He expresses the highest admiration for Harnack and finds in him the true discoverer of the essence of Christianity in the Gospel of Jesus. At the same time he protests against the extreme criticism of Wellhausen, second only to Harnack among German scholars, who sacrifices not only the greatest part of the Sermon on the Mount but also those very sayings from the Logia-source (Q) which have been regarded as the most genuine, including even the Lord's Prayer, and who, like Schmiedel, regards everything that might have arisen in any wise at a later date as spurious.

BOUSSET.—This survey of German Christology will close with the name of Bousset, who has done work of the most praiseworthy character in connection with the history of the condition of Judaism at the dawn of the Christian era.

His criticism of the Gospel sayings is as severe as that of Wellhausen, and he only allows a few of our Lord's sayings to stand as historically trustworthy, such as the Parable of the Prodigal Son, His teaching concerning the Fatherhood of God, and His disputes with the Pharisees.

Speaking of the Person of Christ he maintains

that historical research has shown that Jesus never outstripped the limits of the purely human, and that throughout His life He placed Himself on the side of man and not on that of God, and never made Himself the object of faith or worship.[1]

ESTLIN CARPENTER.—This liberal Christology is not without its representatives among English scholars, the best known among them being possibly Dr. Estlin Carpenter, whose work in the domain of Biblical literature, in spite of his adhesion to the German or "reduced" Christianity, is extremely valuable. His description of the Jesus of St. Mark[2] will serve as a useful illustration of his point of view: "The Jesus of Mark is a man, with a man's wrath and disappointment. He cannot do everything, and he does not know everything. But he is the founder of a 'new teaching' in virtue of which the troubled and restless come to him and are healed. He proclaims the rule of God in the world received and established in the heart of man. In the innocence and unconsciousness of childhood he finds the nearest approach to the realisation of this rule. Childlike obedience to God and brotherly love towards man are the two great ideas with which he will win over the sinful and regenerate the world. Difficulty cannot overcome him, or danger daunt, or opposition suppress him. He may perish but his cause is eternal. The kingdom will triumph! the Son of Man will come." In his later work on *The Historical Jesus and the Theological Christ* the treatment is reverent, and he has a strong sense of the majesty of the historical Jesus and of the might of the theological Christ, but his standpoint is definitely that of Harnack and his school.

[1] See Bousset, *Jesus.* [2] *The First Three Gospels*, p. 217.

The main weakness of this liberal Christology is, to state the matter briefly, that it draws a portrait of Jesus which does not overstep the limits of the human, and yet claims for this conception of the Ideal Man the very extremes of spiritual value, and sets him up as an object of religious worship. It has frankly broken with orthodoxy and its miraculous Christ, and yet retains for Him a central and unique position in relation to humanity. It holds Him divine in a singular sense, and sees in Jesus an incarnation or embodiment of all those liberal and liberalising ideas which characterise our own time, and would trace to Him the modern mind and ethos as its first source and impulse.[1] Sanday's [2] remark that we are tempted to ask whether all this spiritual value is legitimately obtained and whether the language used by this school, to be fully justified, does not require a background of more orthodox doctrine, is very much to the point. Their treatment of the Gospel documents lays them open to the charge of retaining only so much of the material that has come down to them as fits in with their construction of the facts and their own conception of the historical possibilities. Schweitzer definitely accuses them of excessive modernising, of deserting the text and reading too much between the lines, and of filling up gaps by a free use of speculative psychology that is incapable of proof. Modern historical theology, according to him, is three-fourths scepticism, and has left in its hands only a torn and tattered Gospel of St. Mark, and the Jesus of its making is conceived in the German spirit of the twentieth

[1] See G. Tyrrell in his essay in *Jesus or Christ.*
[2] Sanday, *Christologies, Ancient and Modern*, p. 196.

century. The most drastic criticism of the school comes from Dr. Neville Figgis[1] in his recent book on *Civilisation at the Cross-Roads*, which, in spite of its exaggeration, is exceedingly relevant: "Of the supernatural, otherworldly claims of Jesus of Nazareth there can be no question, and there never would have been but for a small circle of pedants who were anxious to retain the name and privilege of Christian while rejecting every element that gave the Faith its power. They desired the historical and traditional charm of the Christian Church while repudiating every element which made that charm possible."

The Services rendered by the Liberal German School.—Whatever be the measure of our approval or disapproval of the Christology formulated by the members of this school there can be no question as to the incomparable value of the contribution rendered by German research to the study of historical Christianity.

The names of Harnack, Wellhausen, Holtzmann, Bousset, and Jülicher, not to mention others, will be regarded with the highest esteem by all New Testament students. Even such an out-and-out opponent of the school as Schweitzer is not slow to recognise the uniqueness and sincerity of their work, while Dr. Sanday is never wearied of expressing his generous appreciation of their honesty, industry, and method.

In one particular direction the work of this school has proved of momentous importance in that it has restored the historical humanity of Jesus to its right place in the conception of His Person. The tendency of orthodox Christology in the past has been in the direction of regarding the Divine and human in

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 146.

Christ as in some ways in contrast and opposition to each other, with the natural result that the human was swallowed up and lost in the Divine. In this respect traditional orthodoxy approached perilously near to the early heresy of Docetism, which allowed no real humanity to Christ. The effect of the work of the Liberal theologians has been that fuller justice is now done to the humanity of our Lord by insisting that the Divine in Him—if Divine there is—must be approached through the human, as it was through the human alone that it manifested itself.

Within the last decade the position of the German Liberal theologians has been challenged from three different directions represented by the "Jesus or Christ" controversy, and the "Christ-Myth," and "Eschatological" theories respectively.

1. In the first of the three, which is mainly a controversy of English origin, although it has its counterpart in Germany under the title of "Jesus or Paul," the identity of the historical Jesus and the theological Christ is confidently challenged, and the very existence of the Christian Church, built upon the Divine Saviour and Lord in whom Jesus of Nazareth and the living Christ are one, is seriously imperilled.

2. In the "Christ-Myth" theory historical criticism is carried to what is maintained to be its one and only logical conclusion. The exponents of this theory assert that the historical-religious methods of the German Liberal school have reduced the authentic details of Christ's life to such negligible dimensions that it only remains to deny *in toto* the very existence of a historical Jesus.

3. The "Eschatological" school entirely repudi-

ates the portrait of Jesus as conceived by Liberal theology. To quote Schweitzer's words: "The Jesus of Nazareth who came forward publicly as the Messiah, who preached the ethic of the Kingdom of God, who founded the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth, and died to give His work its final consecration, never had any existence. He is a figure designed by rationalism, endowed with life by liberalism, and clothed by modern theology in historical garb."

This chapter may fittingly close with the following quotation from Neville Figgis: "Liberal theology is breaking up under the pressure of mutual criticism, and the issue is daily clearer between those who accept Jesus Christ with His supernatural claims and those who since they are unable to credit the claim repudiate His leadership. The half-way house of German liberalism is built on sands, the storm of the apocalyptic problem is shaking it in pieces." [1]

[1] Neville Figgis, *Civilisation at the Cross-Roads*, p. 146.

CHAPTER III

CHRIST IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY (*contd.*)

"JESUS OR CHRIST"

CRITICISM in the past has made us familiar with the supposed cleavage between the historical Christianity of our own age and that of the New Testament, and with the consequent demand for a thorough revision of our Christian conceptions in the light of the new and drastic study of our original authorities as contained in the New Testament. This type of criticism has now, however, advanced a step further, and postulates a cleavage within the limits of the New Testament itself. The question is no longer whether modern Christianity can be justified by an appeal to the New Testament, but whether the New Testament itself is a consistent unity; or, to put it in other words, Does the Christian religion as it is exhibited in the New Testament bear any essential relation to Jesus as He is revealed in history? That tributaries have flowed into the main Christian stream from many quarters in the course of the ages, colouring it and sometimes even fouling its purity, is possibly beyond question, but it is now freely asserted that this process is not confined to the later periods of the Church's life, and that it can be detected within the pages of the New Testament itself. The latter,

therefore, can no longer be regarded as an indefectible standard wherewith to restore Christianity to its original purity and truth if this theory is capable of being proved. Babylonian and Persian mythologies, Hellenistic and Oriental Mysteries, and Alexandrian philosophy will have had their say not only in the later developments of the Christian religion, but some of the most salient characteristics of Christian doctrine and practice, such as the Christology of the Apostolic age, the sacramental teaching of St. Paul, and the nascent Catholicism of the Acts and Pastoral Epistles can be traced to these sources, and can have little or no connection with the teaching and practice of the historical Jesus.

This attitude of recent criticism, which denies the unity of the New Testament, and whose main purpose is to create a breach between the Jesus of history and the Christ of worship has attracted considerable interest in our own country, and has given rise to a noted controversy under the title of " Jesus or Christ."

This controversy is in some ways the direct outcome of the scientific historical method in the realm of religion and of the Christological conception which is the main product of that method. Its more immediate origin is, however, due to an article written by the Rev. R. Roberts, a Nonconformist minister, in the *Hibbert Journal* for January 1909. This article elicited a number of rejoinders from prominent English, American, and Continental scholars, representing the Anglican, Roman, and Protestant Churches, which were published in a volume, as a supplement to the journal in which it appeared, under the title of *Jesus or Christ.*

Mr. Roberts accepts the extreme conclusions of

religious-historical criticism as it affects the Gospels and the Person of Christ, and then formulates his problem in these terms: "Are the claims of orthodox Christians on behalf of Jesus Christ made on behalf of Christ, a spiritual Ideal, or are they predicated of a historical Jesus? or in other words, Is it justifiable to use in a statement of doctrine the terms 'Jesus' or 'Christ' interchangeably?" In order to enable us to realise the force of this question it is essential that we should understand Mr. Roberts' standpoint with regard to the Person and teaching of Jesus. According to him the Jesus who is discoverable from the limited material salvaged from the wreck of the Gospel history on the rock of historical criticism is One whose knowledge is deficient, who shared in the current misconceptions of His age, such as possession by evil spirits and the efficacy of exorcism, and to whom science, and art, and political institutions are an unknown world. His moral teaching is not above reproach, as may be illustrated by His inculcation of almsgiving, which implies a failure of social justice, His tacit acknowledgment of sex-inferiority as against women, the lack of any condemnation of the cruel law of creditor and debtor, and His utter condemnation of provident regard for the future.

This portrait of Jesus is not strikingly original, and has much in common with that of rationalism generally, and more especially perhaps with that set forth by E. von Hartmann in his work entitled *Das Christentums des Neuen Testaments*, 1905.

Granted the historicity of Mr. Roberts' conception of Jesus we must allow that there is considerable force in his protest against the practice of eminent divines and theologians who habitually quote words

and actions attributed to Jesus and apply them to Christ, and thus gain for the mystical and spiritual Christ that objectivity which belongs properly to Jesus. He maintains, *e.g.*, that the language of Dr. Fairbairn concerning the historical Jesus in the following quotation is absolutely unjustifiable: "The Person that literature felt to be its loftiest ideal, philosophy conceived as its highest personality, criticism as its supreme problem, theology as its fundamental dictum, religion as its cardinal necessity"; and is equally severe upon the Rev. E. Griffith Jones, who speaks of Jesus Christ as "the truth, the life, the saving grace, the Desire of all nations, the Crown and Essence of Humanity, the Saviour of the world, who by the loftiness of His teaching, the beauty of His character, the suffering of His atoning grace, is able to save to the uttermost all who will come to Him and trust in Him." This type of language is, according to Mr. Roberts, the monopoly of the Christ-Ideal, and is in no way commensurate with the Jesus of the Gospels, with His limitations of outlook, His evasions of issues, and disillusionments of experience. He, therefore, entirely condemns the normal language of Catholicism, which pictures Jesus as the universal Key, the final perfection of humanity's reach, the Divine Exemplar, towards whose far-off, infinitely distant perfection humanity must aspire and toil through the illimitable ages of the future.

It will be readily understood that the representatives of Liberal theology find it a matter of considerable difficulty to ward off Mr. Roberts' attacks with any marked degree of success, and the contributions of Schmiedel, Weinel, and of the American, B. W. Bacon, to the volume we have referred to are by no

means convincing. They certainly, as Dr. Sanday[1] has remarked, make the fullest use of the "reduced" Christianity that they are prepared to accept, but they have made such wholesale concessions to criticism that it is wellnigh impossible to identify the Jesus of the Gospels as they conceive Him with the Christ for whom they claim such transcendent power and position. There is nothing better, however, in the whole volume than the essay of Dr. Percy Gardner,[2] a scholar of decidedly liberal views, whose contribution is of real value as demonstrating the essential identity of the Jesus of the Gospels with the Christ of the Epistles and the unbroken continuity of the movement which originated with Jesus and was developed by St. Paul and the early Christian Church. He points out that in coming to a decision on this point we have to take into account two sets of facts. First of all we have the picture of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, as of one who partook in every way of human nature and was bounded by human limitations. But we also have another range of facts, facts of history and facts of experience, even more undeniable and better attested historically than the first set. The evidence here is of higher historical value than the Gospels because it rests upon the Pauline Epistles, which were essentially documents contemporary with the events themselves.

Now these documents prove unmistakably that a most remarkable movement was taking place in the spirits of men, and that St. Paul himself was the most striking example of that movement. The existence of the Christian Church from the first

[1] Sanday, *Christologies, Ancient and Modern*, p. 196.
[2] *Jesus or Christ*, pp. 45-56.

depended upon the possibility of these two sets of facts, the one connected with Jesus, the other connected with Christ, being brought into vital relation to each other in Jesus-Christ, and the Church may, therefore, be said to be built upon a hyphen. He argues strongly that the view that there was a continuity of spiritual power running from the human life of Jesus into the life of the Christian Church can be reasonably held, and that it does not contradict the ascertained results of historic investigation. He then proceeds to show that the characteristic and indeed unparalleled features of early Christianity admit of no other interpretation. The astonishing life of the Master, which has filled the majority of thinking men with unbounded admiration, the wonderful change which, after the Crucifixion, transformed the Apostles from timid and unintelligent disciples into bold and effective missionaries of the faith, the rapid increase of the Church in the face of bitter hostility and persecution and its unique power of adaptation whereby the doctrine of an obscure Jewish sect became the religion of the Graeco-Roman world, are intelligible only on the assumption that a spiritual power of a new kind and of greatly superior force had dawned upon the world, and that that power had its fount and origin in Jesus. Summing up the argument he maintains that He who came to the earth as Jesus has dwelt there to these days as Jesus Christ, and that the Christian consciousness of our day is one with the consciousness which has set apart the followers of Christ from the world since the day when the Apostles realised that though their Master was hidden from sight He was with them until the end of the world.

Those who accept a "full" as opposed to a "reduced" Christianity are confronted with a much easier task than Schmiedel and his brethren, and experience little or no difficulty in disposing of Mr. Roberts' contentions. A glance at Canon Scott Holland's[1] forcible paper affords a good illustration of this. He makes a strong point of the fact that the Synoptic picture of the historical Jesus proceeded out of the very heart of the Church and that at a time when it was in full possession of the Christological faith, and that the very same people who worship the Christ of the Epistles put together and accepted the record in the Gospels. Yet not a sign of their mystical creed is allowed to intrude upon the facts of the Gospel, and not a word is said of a "life in Christ" or of the actual experience of new life "in the spirit," and what is more remarkable still, hardly a hint of the revolutionary fact of the inclusion of the Gentiles within the fold of the Church, while the Gospels are not even remotely tinged by Hellenistic or Gentile thought. The argument is further strengthened by a reference to the Passion story as given by St. Luke, who must of necessity have been saturated with the Christological conceptions of his master and teacher, St. Paul. Yet St. Luke tells the entire story as a simple historical incident in the career of Jesus, without the slightest hint that it was of infinitely greater significance than this. That the issues of the world's redemption were vitally connected with that terrible tragedy is not even implied, and yet St. Luke certainly believed it and his readers as certainly felt it. Thus for the Apostolic Church there was no hint of variance or conflict between the

[1] *Jesus or Christ*, p. 126 f.

Christ who offered the sacrifice to God and the Jesus of Nazareth condemned to die on the Cross by wicked men, but on the contrary it was faith in that Christ that gave significance to every little detail in the facts of the human tragedy. Because they believed Him as Christ, the Son of God, therefore they found a precious value in the narrative of every incident that befell the Son of Man. There was no collision, they passed smoothly from one conception to the other, and the identity was absolutely complete.

I will only add one further consideration which tells strongly against the disjunctive theory. If we attach any real historical value to the early chapters of the Acts, and even Schmiedel allows that the Christology of the speeches of St. Peter must have come from a primary source, it is quite clear that in the earliest faith of the Christian Church as represented by the teaching of St. Peter, Jesus held that position of supreme dignity which the Church has assigned to Him in all ages. To the Apostolic Church of the first Pentecost Jesus is the Christ, the Prince of Life, the Lord of all, Judge of the living and dead, seated at God's right hand, the Giver of the Spirit, the Fulfiller of all the promises of God.

A word must be said here in reference to Dr. Sanday's recent attempt to solve the problem of Christology on the lines of psychology and to interpret the relation between the Divine and the human in the consciousness of our Lord by means of the theory of the subliminal self. This is a case where preciseness of language is absolutely essential, and it is safer, therefore, to state Dr. Sanday's theory or hypothesis, for more than this he does not claim for it, in his own words.

He accepts Mr. Myers' conception of the subliminal self which has been quoted in a previous chapter,[1] and extends its application first of all to explain the locus of the Divine in man, and then, by means of an analogy between human personality and that of Christ, seeks to find in the subliminal consciousness of Christ the seat of the Deity in Him. To quote his own words: "It seems to me that the analogy of our human selves can at least to this extent be transferred to the Incarnate Christ. If whatever we have of Divine must needs pass through a strictly human medium, the same law should hold good even for Him. . . . We have seen what difficulties are involved in the attempt to draw, as it were, a vertical line between the human nature and the Divine nature of Christ, and to say that certain actions of His fall on one side of this line and certain other actions on the other. But these difficulties disappear if, instead of drawing a vertical line, we rather draw a horizontal line between the upper human medium which is the proper and natural field of all active expression and those lower depths which are no less the proper and natural home of whatever is Divine. This line is inevitably drawn in the region of the subconscious. That which was Divine in Christ was not nakedly exposed to the public gaze; neither was it so entirely withdrawn from outward view as to be wholly sunk and submerged in the darkness of the unconscious; but there was a Jacob's ladder by which the Divine forces stored up below found an outlet, as it were, to the upper air and the common theatre in which the life of mankind is enacted." [2]

[1] See p. 11.

[2] Sanday, *Christologies, Ancient and Modern*, pp. 165, 166.

This hypothesis has been received with the respect that everything which emanates from a scholar and theologian of Dr. Sanday's position and reputation deserves, but it cannot be said to have commended itself as yet to any considerable body of thinkers. It is only described by the author himself as an attempt to arrive at a "tentative Christology," and, although exceedingly suggestive and attractive on account of its very freshness, it does not seem likely to advance beyond the tentative stage. The objections to it are undoubtedly numerous and weighty. Dr. Garvie in the *Expository Times* for April 1913 lays strong emphasis on the fact that, according to this hypothesis, the Divinity of Jesus is only manifested occasionally and intermittently, whereas the true value of Christ's Person for the Christian Faith lies here first of all and most of all, that in Him Divinity is not concealed but revealed. Dr. Mackintosh, in the same journal for August and September 1910, and in his recent work on *The Person of Christ*,[1] formulates two objections to the theory. First of all there arises the question whether the subconscious has a moral character at all. If any real analogy exists between human personality and the Person of Christ it is difficult to associate the Divine in the latter with a region which in the former contains impulses which may be regarded as Divine, but also, as is allowed by Dr. Sanday himself, those of a directly opposite type. Are we then justified in deciding that this region of psychic life, of which we have so little real definite knowledge, is the seat and dwelling-place of Deity, that there *par excellence* is a receptacle suited and adapted for the presence of God in man.

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 488.

Again it does not seem to remove the old difficulty of the two natures, and leaves us still with the dualism of tradition. It draws a horizontal instead of a vertical line between the human and Divine in Christ, but it does not explain how, if Godhead and manhood are one in Jesus, both are present everywhere and in each part and region of His experience, with no line between them which could obscure the vital fact that the character of God, which is ethical through and through, is actually being revealed in our human conditions, and nothing less than this can satisfy the demands of the Christian faith.

CHAPTER IV

CHRIST IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY (*contd.*)

"JESUS OR PAUL"

LITERATURE FOR CHAPTER IV.

Feine, *Jesus Christus und Paulus.* 1902.
Clemen, *Paulus.* 1905.
Von Soden, *The Writings of the New Testament.* 1905.
Weinel, *St. Paul, the Man and his Work.* 1906. E.T.
Wrede, *Paul.* 1907. E.T.
Cambridge Biblical Essays. 1909.
A. Meyer, *Jesus or Paul.* 1909. E.T.
J. Weiss, *Paul and Jesus.* 1909. E.T.
Von Dobschütz, *The Apostolic Age.* 1909. E.T.
Knowling, *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ.* 1911.
J. H. Moulton, "The Gospel according to Paul," *Expositor*, viii. 2.

THE most important witness, whose evidence on the question of the identity of Jesus with the Christ one would imagine to be decisive, is St. Paul. He is to all intents and purposes a contemporary of our Lord's, and has left behind him a mass of literature, the authenticity of the greater proportion of which is generally accepted as beyond question and some of which was in existence within twenty years of our Lord's death. The evidence of St. Paul and its interpretation by recent criticism introduces us to the form which the controversy discussed in the last chapter has taken in Germany, where, under the title of "Jesus or Paul," the issue has been somewhat more closely defined than has been the case in this

country. The efforts of criticism have in both cases taken precisely the same direction. Here again the main purpose is to dissociate the Jesus of history from the Christ of faith and worship, but the method of procedure is to some extent different from that we have been discussing. In this case St. Paul himself is made the scapegoat, and upon him principally is laid the responsibility of so transforming the "simple Gospel" of Jesus of Nazareth as practically to subvert and destroy its content. St. Paul, according to this theory, "was an unauthorised intruder whose thought and influence must be eliminated before we can secure a just view of Jesus and a true appreciation of His religion." [1] Some writers, as *e.g.* Gunkel, go so far as to assert that his influence was positively mischievous, and that it would have been all over with Christianity as a beneficent historical force if the Synoptic Gospels had not come to the front and established an ascendancy in the Church which to a great extent neutralised the Pauline Gospel, and this opinion is endorsed by Arnold Meyer. A short *résumé* of the views of the late Dr. Wrede of Breslau, the most eminent exponent of this theory, as they are stated in his brief but epoch-making *brochure* upon *Paul*, will give the reader a very clear idea of the trend of recent German thought in relation to our subject.

Wrede's main postulate is that St. Paul's picture of Christ did not originate in an expression of the personality of Jesus. Long before he became a follower of His he had believed in a celestial Being, a Divine Christ, and when Jesus appeared before him on the road to Damascus in the shining glory of His

[1] *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 331.

risen existence St. Paul straightway transferred to Him all the conceptions which he already had of the Divine celestial Being—such as His pre-existence before the world, and His function in creation. The Pauline Christ, therefore, cannot be understood except on the assumption that St. Paul, while still a Pharisee, possessed a number of definite conceptions concerning this Divine Being which were afterwards transferred to the historical Jesus. Wrede thus demands what is to all intents and purposes nothing less than a mythical origin for St. Paul's Christology, and he is honest enough to acknowledge this, as the following quotation will show: "A doctrine whose profundity has endowed millions of hearts with the best of their possessions . . . a doctrine which even to-day comforts and fills with peace thousands upon thousands of good and earnest people, a doctrine which has given the thought of Divine love and grace and human sinfulness their most powerful expression, such a doctrine we treat with reverence . . . but the thought that a Divine Being forsakes heaven, veils Himself in humanity, and then dies in order to ascend again into heaven is necessarily in its own essence mythological." [1]

St. Paul is, therefore, not the theological expounder and successor of Jesus but the real creator of Christian theology, and this theology was in no way determined by the life work and life picture of Jesus. Above all it was St. Paul that made Christianity the religion of redemption, and it was he who laid the foundation of religion in three acts of salvation, in the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of Christ. The ideas, therefore, whose influence in the history of Christianity

[1] Wrede, *Paul*, p. 179.

have been deepest and most wide-reaching, owe their existence to the Apostle, and great teachers like Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, Augustine, Anselm, Luther, and Calvin cannot be understood on the ground of the teaching and personality of Jesus, but on the ground of what they shared with St. Paul, namely, the history of salvation. St. Paul was thus the second founder of Christianity, and, as compared with Jesus, exercised beyond all doubt the stronger, not the better influence, and throughout long stretches of history he has thrust that greater Person, whom he meant only to serve, utterly into the background.

Wrede buttresses his theory by asserting that what we prize in Jesus played no part whatsoever in the thought of the Apostle. Nothing was further aloof from his mind than religious veneration, and the moral majesty of Jesus, His purity and piety, His ministry among the people, His manner as a prophet, the whole concrete ethical religious content of His earthly life signified nothing whatever for St. Paul's Christology. On the other hand, of that which was to St. Paul all and everything Jesus knew nothing. More especially He attributed to His death no such significance as the Apostle attributed to it.[1]

It is not possible in the course of a single chapter to give more than a cursory sketch of the more important points involved in this controversy, and for a full and adequate treatment of the subject I would refer the student to Knowling's *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, Feine's *Jesus Christus und Paulus*, and especially to Dr. Anderson Scott's capital paper on "Jesus and Paul" in the *Cambridge Biblical Essays*,

[1] For the above summary of Wrede's opinions see his *Paul*, pp. 146-180.

to all of which I am much indebted for what follows here.

The attempt to make St. Paul responsible for the Christological developments which are exhibited within the limits of the New Testament and for the main belief of the Church as to the Person of Christ, is based mainly on two grounds.

It is argued :

1. That St. Paul knew practically little or nothing of the details of the life of Jesus, and that His earthly career was of no interest to him. The Christ that he portrays must therefore have been an ideal and theological Christ and not a real historical Being.

2. That the evidence of the Synoptic Gospels and the Pauline Epistles respectively reveals such an essential distinction between the teaching of Jesus and that of the Apostle as to render it all but impossible to believe that St. Paul was in any real sense a disciple and follower of the Jesus of the Gospels.

We will deal with each of these statements separately :

1. It will simplify our task in dealing with the first argument if we acknowledge at the outset that to St. Paul the importance of the risen exalted Christ far outweighed that of the Jesus of Nazareth, who spent His life among the people of Galilee and taught and healed them. His Gospel may in some sense be said to have opened at the point where the life of Jesus according to the flesh ends, and the events of the early life of Jesus had for him little interest compared with the existence of the glorified Christ who was the object of his faith and worship. But to acknowledge this is not to imply that in the Apostle's mind there could be any thought of separa-

tion between the historical Jesus and the exalted Christ. That St. Paul lays special emphasis upon the last great act in the drama of Christ's work and life, and that the Death and Resurrection occupy the place of primary importance in his doctrinal thought is undeniable, but that he knew nothing and cared less for the details of our Lord's ministry and for the content of His preaching is not borne out by his writings if studied with due care and honesty. As a matter of fact, the Epistles presuppose a very considerable knowledge of and a close interest in the pre-crucifixion life of Jesus on St. Paul's part, and further, the career of St. Paul both as a persecutor and missionary are inexplicable apart from some such supposition. The following brief summary will enable us to realise the extent of the Apostle's acquaintance with the details of the life and teaching of Jesus.

(*a*) *St. Paul's Acquaintance with the Facts concerning the Life and Ministry of Jesus.*—In respect of the *identity* of Jesus he knew that He was a Man (1 Cor. xv. 21), born of a woman and under the Law (Gal. iv. 4), a descendant of Abraham (Gal. iii. 16), a minister of the circumcision (Rom. xv. 8), a "brother" of James and other leaders of the Church (Gal. i. 19). As to the character of Jesus he tells us that He was wholly obedient to God (Rom. v. 19), an adequate subject for imitation by men (1 Cor. xi. 1), and pictures Him as loving men, as gentle, and as pleasing not Himself. The virtues which he ascribes to Christ are those which in the Gospels are ascribed to Jesus, viz. obedience, humility, meekness, gentleness, unselfishness, peaceableness, righteousness, and truthfulness.

Of the *incidents* connected with the life of Jesus he is careful to tell us that the Eucharist was instituted

on the night of the betrayal. He is familiar with the method of His death by crucifixion, and he tells us that the Jews were responsible for His murder (1 Thess. ii. 15). He knows of the appearances after the Resurrection, and is in truth our primary witness for the historicity of that event (1 Cor. xv.). The "Twelve" is a common term in his letters, and in passages like Gal. i. 18-22, where he mentions Cephas and James the Lord's brother without further explanation, he uses language which implies no slight knowledge of the facts relating to Jesus and His immediate circle on the part of the Churches of Galatia.

(*b*) *St. Paul's Acquaintance with the Teaching of Jesus.*—He quotes the Master's teaching as authoritative and decisive with regard to such questions as marriage (1 Cor. vii.), the right of the ministers of the Church to maintenance (1 Cor. ix. 14), the celebration of the Eucharist (1 Cor. xi. 23), and the manner of the resurrection of the dead (1 Thess. iv. 15). It is also to be noted that he draws a line of demarcation between disputed questions in which he could appeal to a definite command of Jesus and those in which he could claim no such authority (1 Cor. vii. 12). In addition to these direct references to the teaching of Jesus, references of a more implicit character are frequent in the Epistles, as *e.g.* in his description of the judgment in 1 Thess. v. 2, where the phrase, "the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night," probably looks back to the great eschatological discourse in St. Matt. xxi.; and in his use of the metaphor of "building" with reference to the Church, which reminds us of our Lord's expression in St. Matt. xvi. 18, "On this rock I will build My

Church." Again it is difficult to imagine that his description of the "Kingdom of God" as "not eating and drinking but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. xiv. 17) can have had any other source than the teaching of Christ Himself. This is also probably true of Rom. xiv. 14, "I am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that there is nothing unclean of itself," which naturally calls to mind our Lord's saying in St. Matt. xv. 11, "Not that which entereth the mouth defileth a man."

The language of 1 Thess. ii. 12, "That ye should walk worthily of God who calleth you into His own kingdom and glory," is probably a reminiscence of the Parable of the Marriage Feast (St. Matt. xxii. 3, 8), while his criticism of the "wisdom of the world" in 1 Cor. i. and ii. reminds us strongly of our Lord's words in St. Matt. xi. 25, "I thank thee . . . that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes."

But besides these direct references to the facts of Jesus' life and to His teaching and the reminiscences of His doctrine, there are further considerations which demand on the part of St. Paul a very considerable acquaintance with His earthly life, His claims, and His character.

Without some such knowledge it is exceedingly difficult to understand why St. Paul ever took upon himself the rôle of a persecutor. Hatred of such a relentless character as he himself with sorrow confesses his hatred of the Christian believers to have been is only possible when based upon facts and reality. In the case of Saul of Tarsus this reality consisted in his knowledge of the story of the Man, Jesus of Nazareth, and of all that that story meant

for the primitive Christian community. It was because the Messiahship itself and the most exalted hopes of the Jewish nation were associated by the Christians with the Person of One whose life he knew in all its details, every one of which contradicted and opposed his deeply cherished ideals, that he persecuted and pursued the Church with all the bitterness that even he was capable of. To imagine Saul as the tireless and pitiless enemy of the followers of a Jesus who was to him little more than a dream and of whose life and character he knew next to nothing, is to misconceive entirely the nature of the man who has been so intimately revealed to us in his letters.

Again, on this theory, it is just as difficult to explain St. Paul the Missionary as it was to understand Saul the persecutor. It is quite inconceivable that in his missionary preaching the Apostle could have disclaimed all knowledge of the particulars relating to the historical Jesus. At the very outset there would face him the enormous difficulty of commending to Gentiles a Saviour who was in all earthly aspects a Jew, a member of the most despised and best hated race in the Empire. Even under the most favourable conditions his task was one that needed all his tact, his courage, and strength of will. Furthermore, it was a task whose only hope of success consisted in its being supported by the most definite facts and realities. To have spoken of Christ as Son of God, the Lord, the Judge, the Saviour, without being able to show that behind these predicates and claims there stood a historical Person whose life and death justified and even transcended this language, was to court failure at the very outset. The Gospel preached by him had to be authenticated by proofs

and arguments, and this necessitated a systematic method of instruction in the main facts of Christ's earthly career and in the principles of His teaching. That this course was actually adopted is abundantly clear from the Epistles. The language of Gal. i. 18-24 presupposes on the part of Galatian Churches a very general acquaintance with the surroundings of Jesus and with the personalities of His immediate associates. Again Gal. iii. 1 and 1 Cor. ii. 2 describe how vividly the Missionary Apostle had represented Jesus to his hearers in proof of the greatness of the love which led Him to lay down His life.

It would seem, therefore, that the assertion that St. Paul knew nothing about the main incidents of the pre-crucifixion life of Jesus and had little or no acquaintance with the content of His teaching still remains to be proved.

The question of how the Apostle attained to this knowledge does not seem to present any inherent difficulty. Indeed the difficulty is to understand how he could have avoided being fairly familiar with events the history of which must have been common property in the very circles in which he habitually moved both before and after his conversion. There is also a growing tendency among scholars to place the conversion itself within a very short interval of our Lord's Crucifixion. Thus Clemen[1] places it within a year of this event, and possibly in the very same year in which the death took place, while von Dobschütz[2] argues that it might have taken place within eighteen months, and must at the latest have

[1] Clemen, *Paulus*, vol. ii. p. 83.
[2] Von Dobschütz, *The Apostolic Age*, p. 8.

happened within five years of the Crucifixion. If we then accept even the latest date postulated by von Dobschütz, St. Paul must have been in Jerusalem within four years or so of the close of our Lord's life. Furthermore, his Christian career brought him into touch with those who were intimately acquainted with every detail of that life, either as eye-witnesses or as members of the earliest Christian community. He himself tells us that within three years of his conversion he went up to Jerusalem to visit St. Peter (Gal. i. 18), and the Greek word he employs, ἱστορῆσαι, is generally associated with the idea of careful and searching enquiry. Later on in his career we find him on more than one occasion brought into close contact with James, the Lord's brother. We know from Acts xxi. 8 that he spent several days in the company of Philip the deacon, and both the Acts and the Epistles emphasise his close connection with Barnabas and Mark, both of whom belonged to the earliest circle of Christian disciples. St. Luke, who wrote the third Gospel and who presumably had some acquaintance with the Gospel narrative, was for some years his most intimate companion, and Marcus and Andronicus, who had joined the Church of Christ before his own conversion, were his kinsmen.

Moreover, it is now being strongly maintained by some scholars of repute that St. Paul had actually seen and known Jesus in the flesh. Johannes Weiss devotes the greater part of his book, *Paul and Jesus*, to proving this statement, and he maintains that this is the only possible interpretation of the Apostle's remark in 2 Cor. v. 16, εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, "even though we have known Christ after the flesh," a conclusion which has received the support

of authorities of such weight as Dr. J. H. Moulton[1] and Sir W. M. Ramsay.[2] His argument runs somewhat as follows. St. Paul was in Jerusalem before the Crucifixion and is found there again not long after that event, and there is no overwhelming reason why he should have left the Holy City in the interval. He was there, therefore, when Jesus came up for the Passion, and possibly might be found in one or more of the deputations which came to Him in the Temple to tempt Him. Some aspects of his teaching in the Epistles may be only reminiscences of what he heard from the lips of Jesus in the course of those discussions, as *e.g.* Rom. xiii. 7, "Render to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute . . .," which may be compared with our Lord's precept, "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's"; his teaching about marriage in 1 Cor. vii. 10-13, where the reference may be to St. Matt. xxii. 23-33; also Rom. ii. 21, "Thou that teachest another teachest thou not thyself?" which may be an echo of St. Matt. xxiii. 3-28, with its stern condemnation of the scribes and Pharisees as "blind leaders of the blind." If we attach any value to these hypotheses it is by no means impossible that Saul of Tarsus was among the fanatics who watched the scene on Calvary. That he took any prominent part in the events which led to the condemnation of Jesus is improbable, as he himself is careful in his confessions of unworthiness to limit his responsibility as a persecutor to the followers of Christ, which he would hardly have done if he had taken an active part in hounding the Master Himself to His death. His presence in Jerusalem and on Calvary would then explain why he practically

[1] *Expositor*, viii. 2. pp. 16-28. [2] *Expositor*, viii. 2. pp. 289-310.

confined himself in his Gospel to the end of the Saviour's earthly life. He knew this for himself at first hand, and this is why for St. Paul the Cross blots out every other sight. It also removes the difficulty connected with the vision on the road to Damascus. He recognised in heavenly glory the Face that he had seen scarred with sorrow on Calvary, as Professor Ramsay has maintained for many a long year. The Apostle's claims to have seen Jesus, recorded in 1 Cor. ix. 1 and xv. 8, would not then be necessarily confined to the appearances of the exalted Christ to him, and may possibly have included occasions when he had already seen Jesus in the flesh during His earthly life.

In any case, whether we accept this theory or not, it is perfectly manifest that the Apostle had had ample opportunities of making himself acquainted with all the principal events in our Lord's life and ministry and with the main content of His preaching. His comparative silence and his apparent indifference with regard to some of the incidents of the ministry and to much of our Lord's teaching are not difficult to explain. First of all we must emphasise the fact that the Pauline literature is entirely confined to letters. The Epistles are not Gospels but letters, and letters, as a rule, written to meet the needs of a special emergency. They are, therefore, precluded by their very nature from containing anything like a general narrative of the life and teaching of Jesus Christ such as we look for in a Gospel. Again most of the letters are written to Churches in which he had already laboured for some considerable period, and in which the Gospel narrative had already been preached and proclaimed. To argue that because St. Paul makes no mention of certain important

events and sayings of our Lord he, therefore, could have had no knowledge of them, is to misconceive the character and purport of his letters. Had there not been certain disorders in connection with the celebration of the Eucharist in the Church of Corinth that Sacrament would not have been referred to at all in the Pauline writings, and, on this theory, St. Paul would have had no knowledge of its institution, and its very existence would have been seriously combated.

2. This brings us to the second main argument of those who would dissociate St. Paul from the Master and separate the Christ of the Apostle's faith and devotion from the Jesus of history.

In this connection it is asserted that the unlikeness between Jesus and the Apostle in regard to some of the cardinal points of Christian doctrine and the absence from the teaching of Jesus of much that is essential in the teaching of St. Paul are clearly incompatible with any real or true relationship between the Master and His alleged disciple.

Here again it is well to recognise that there are differences, and serious differences, between the teaching of Jesus and the teaching of the Apostle, but they are differences which are capable of reasonable explanation, and in no way warrant the extreme conclusions which are based on them by the representatives of this particular school.

The recognition of a distinction more or less fundamental between the Gospel of Jesus and the Gospel of St. Paul was primarily due to the Tübingen school, and was formulated mainly with reference to the Apostle's teaching about Law and its cognate subjects, sin and justification by faith, and his doctrine of the Person of Christ. A superficial com-

parison of the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles may very possibly justify the charge that the disparity between Jesus and St. Paul in regard to the Law is essential. Jesus proclaimed that He came not to destroy the Law but to fulfil it, and that no jot or tittle of it should pass away. St. Paul, on the other hand, can find no language too strong to express his contempt for its ineffectiveness and his hatred of its consequences, and in Gal. iii. 13 he even goes so far as to speak of "the curse of the law," while he is equally emphatic in his expression of heartfelt joy that it has ceased to have any authority or weight in regard to those who are in Christ.

Again, a similar distinction apparently exists between Jesus' conception of sin and that of the Apostle. Our Lord is concerned with sin as something that is exclusively practical, while St. Paul moves in a world of concepts which are treated and employed as concepts only. All the phenomena of the religious life are ranged by him under general categories. Sin is, therefore, for him not so much an important factor in life but rather a matter of speculative interest, whose origin, history, and universality need careful and systematic treatment.

Now differences between Jesus and St. Paul are only to be expected, and are involved in the distinction which the Church draws between the Founder and even the most truly inspired of His followers. Dr. Anderson Scott,[1] in the essay already cited, explains that the wide divergencies between the teachings are due to three distinctions of experience between Jesus and St. Paul.

1. Jesus never knew the sense of dependence on

[1] *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 343.

any authority in religion except the will of the Father. St. Paul with very rare exceptions shows himself entirely dependent on the authority of Another, "the Lord Jesus Christ."

2. Jesus never knew the sense of guilt or the power of sin to separate between man and God.

3. Jesus, therefore, never had the sense of the Law as an intolerable tyranny and failure, which did so much to colour St. Paul's treatment of the subject.

But the unlikeness between the respective teachings is not so fundamental as appears at first sight. Sin, even to Jesus, is universal, lies at the basis of every man's character, and must be got rid of at all costs. It is the one thing that separates man from God, and is an offence which can only be met by the Divine forgiveness. He has no language too stern to express His condemnation of the exclusiveness, hypocrisy, and wilful blindness to good which He found in the Pharisees.

Again, if we interpret our Lord's announcement that He came to fulfil the Law in the light of His further teaching, we find that it involved both criticism and change of the Law, and even authority to set it aside. We may instance His treatment of the law of fasting and of the Sabbath as illustrations of this statement, and more especially His attitude towards the law of divorce, which, unlike the two former, was not a ceremonial enactment only. Even the Ten Commandments are transformed by the interpretation He placed upon them. When we consider the Apostle's treatment of the Law we find that his sternest criticism is concerned with the ceremonial element in it and that the contents of the Law on its ethical side are still authoritative for

the Christian ideal of character. Furthermore, it is worth noting that nothing that St. Paul said about the Law was more severe than what Jesus said about "lawyers." [1]

The second group of divergencies is connected with the teaching of St. Paul as to the Person and Work of Christ. The tendency of the school whose views we have been discussing is to attribute to the Apostle all that looks towards the Divine authority and status of Christ.

The antithesis is put in the extreme form of setting up a purely human Synoptic Jesus as against a pre-existent, heavenly, Divine Christ of St. Paul. Thus we are told that the Jesus of the Gospels is He who went about doing good, spending His days as a Man amongst men, teaching and healing the crowds. He accepts an invitation to a wedding, weeps at a funeral, takes His place among the guests at a feast, and leads an existence which is on the whole bound by purely human limitations. Yet this aspect of His life and work is practically ignored in the Pauline Epistles, and the Christ of St. Paul is the Lord from heaven, the Son of the most High God, who sits at the right hand of the Father. It is Christ crucified and raised from the dead, and in virtue of this exalted to be King and Judge, who is the object of his preaching. By faith in Him the sinner is justified; He is also the Head of the Church, and in Him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

Without accepting all that is involved in the foregoing antithesis we may readily acknowledge that there is a considerable amount of truth underlying it. Differences there are undoubtedly between the

[1] *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 349.

Synoptic and Pauline conceptions, but they are differences which can be accounted for, and which may be explained in two directions.

(*a*) By the personal experience of St. Paul. (*b*) By the needs of the Church at the Apostolic period.

(*a*) The most potent factor in the formation of St. Paul's theological thought was undoubtedly the vision of the risen Christ on the road to Damascus which lay at the root of his conversion. It was the Christ who appeared to him then, and the Christ whom he had known through the medium of his own personal experience, that was the object of the Apostle's faith and devoted service. The more closely we study his speeches and letters the more apparent does it become that the whole of his theological atmosphere is coloured by the thought of his own experience in Christ, and that the whole of his doctrine centres in the fact of his conversion. It has been well said by Professor Ramsay that "in the Divine reckoning Paul's life begins from his conversion and his call to the Gentiles. The conversion is the epoch-making fact. On our conception of that one fact depends our whole view of his life, and every action must be considered in relation to the conversion." [1]

It was the risen Christ from heaven who appeared to him in that wondrous vision, and it is, therefore, Christ crucified, but raised from the dead and ascended into heaven, where He sits at the right hand of the Father, who is the object of his adoration and consuming love. This was the Christ who had effected his deliverance from the darkness of despair and brought him to His marvellous light, and this was

[1] Ramsay, *Hist. Commentary on the Galatians*, p. 272.

the Christ, therefore, that he reveals and proclaims to every soul within hearing. It is not unnatural, therefore, that in the face of this the events of the earthly life of our Lord should seem to him of comparatively little importance, and that the whole of his being should be made captive to the Lord who reigns from heaven.

His attitude towards the Law is also to be explained on similar lines. It was in his zeal for the Law that he had undertaken the journey to Damascus in order to destroy the followers of One who had suffered death as the penalty of Law, and who still continued to outrage the Law. It was then that the vision intervened, and He who was supposed to have suffered the last penalty of the Law is found to be a living and Divine reality. Christ, therefore, had done away with the Law; it was now satisfied and had no longer any effect upon Him. It had done its worst and had now ceased to exist for Him. His servant becoming identified with Him by faith was "crucified with Him," and he, therefore, like his Master, had died to the Law. Law had now no meaning for him, and he entered a new life in Christ, so that anything in the nature of a return to the region of Law was unnatural and unthinkable.

The great characteristic Pauline doctrine of "justification by faith" is also rooted in the fact of his conversion, and has no meaning apart from it. It was the necessary corollary to his own deliverance from the darkness and despair which were inseparably connected with his previous life in Judaism. The one aim and object of that life had been the effort to attain unto righteousness, and this had been the ruling principle of the whole of his pre-Christian

career. The strictness of the Pharisee in keeping the observances of the Law, moral and ceremonial, and the zeal of the persecutor are explained by this consuming desire to achieve righteousness before God. But all had been in vain. "Righteousness," as he understood it, proved by such means unattainable, despair and misery were the sole outcome of his efforts. And then there had come, without any warning, the revelation of the "Righteous One," and his darkened soul was illumined with light. "Righteousness" was attainable, and that in all its fulness, comprising the blotting out of the sins of the past and an inheritance among them that are sanctified in the future. Furthermore, his own experience is the guarantee that this "righteousness" is within reach of all without distinction of race, language, or religion, with only one condition, the possession of "faith" on the part of the seeker. His own deliverance from the depths of misery, the successful termination to his life's effort, the completest satisfaction of the deepest needs of his own soul had been attained in entire independence of his previous racial or religious position. His Judaism, his knowledge and practice of the Mosaic Law, had done nothing more for him than reveal the need of some higher gift than they could supply, and what was possible for him was, by God's grace, within reach of all who seek the Lord "in faith."

So then we trace in St. Paul's thought a development from the concrete into the abstract, from experiences to principles, a transference from life into the realm of ideas, where the very depths of his inmost soul are stated in terms of theological and philosophical import. That the process was intensi-

fied by his later experiences and by the conditions surrounding his mission to the Gentiles is certain, but it is difficult to find any support in the Epistles for Wrede's assumption[1] that his attitude towards the Law and his doctrine of "justification" can be fully explained by the exigencies of the mission to the heathen, and had no vital connection with his conversion and his personal experiences in Christ.

The attempt has been made here to trace to their source only the *basal* elements in St. Paul's religious and theological development. That other and secondary causes contributed their share is probably true, and the debt owed by the Apostle, if any existed, to Hellenistic thought in general, and to the "Mystery Religions" in particular, will be dealt with in a later chapter.

(*b*) The disparity between the simple Christology of the Synoptic Gospels and its more developed form in the Pauline Epistles is also explained by the peculiar needs of the Apostolic Church at that period. The Gospels give a narrative of the life of Jesus, but they create and leave unsatisfied the demand for an explanation of His function in the world and the relation to that of His life and death. As time progressed the necessity for interpretation arose, and with the advent of the Apostle's world-wide mission we come to the threshold of the age of exegesis. The simple narrative of the Gospels does not fully meet the demands of the cosmopolitan Christian community, and the questions Why? and How? call for an answer. The simple Christology of the Gospel narrative gives place, therefore, to the more mature and more developed conceptions of Apostolic Christianity. The

[1] Wrede, *Paulus*, p. 146.

primitive Gospel tradition was admirably adapted to meet the needs of local communities in Judaea, but St. Paul was face to face with the Graeco-Roman world, and the Gospel of Christ, if it was to gain a firm footing in that world, had now to be presented in a form which would appeal to the varied culture and civilisation of the Roman Empire.

There is still one further argument which may be adduced in favour of the essential identity of the faith and Christology of St. Paul with that of the Synoptic Gospels. It will hardly be denied that the Christology of the primitive Church, as represented by the "Twelve," is the natural outcome and growth of the teaching of Jesus and represents the original Christian interpretation of the Life, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. If the theory we have been discussing had any real foundation in fact we should expect to find evidence of a deep cleavage between the teaching of St. Paul as to the Person of Christ and the faith professed by the primitive Church in Jerusalem. The Apostolic Church was not without its differences and there were controversies of no slight importance, but they are entirely confined to the question of the admission, or the conditions of the admission, of Gentiles into the Christian Church. St. Paul had his own very definite ideas, and in some sense preached a Gospel of his own in this connection; but both he and the "Twelve" stood on absolutely common ground in their conceptions of our Lord's Person and claims, and there is no evidence that in relation to the true place of Christ in the Christian system there was ever the slightest difference or cleavage. When he writes to Churches which he had not founded himself, and which had received

their knowledge of Christ from others than himself, there is not a trace of any consciousness that he has any fresh knowledge of, or any new ideas concerning, Christ to impart. The faith they profess is the same as his own, and the Lord whom they worship is one with the Lord whom he preaches and serves.

I am well aware that the Synoptic Gospels themselves are alleged to be seriously infected by the influence of St. Paul, and that any reference to the redemptive power of Christ in St. Mark, *e.g.*, is said to be only explained by the intrusion of Pauline features into the original document.

It is somewhat difficult, however, to understand why the same influence which inserted St. Mark x. 45, "To give his life a ransom for many," did not bring about the omission of St. Mark vii. 27, "It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs," a text which goes in the very teeth of the Pauline doctrine and practice. If this custom of interpolating Pauline elements into the genuine Gospel tradition for dogmatic purposes prevailed to any great extent it is strange that some of the Apostle's essential principles should have not been more directly enunciated in the Gospels. We have seen that the only verse in St. Mark directly bearing on the question of the admission of the Gentiles is absolutely hostile to St. Paul's standpoint, and St. Paul himself never claims or quotes a single saying of Jesus in support of his contention that the barrier between Jew and Gentile had been broken down.

It would seem, then, that the attempt to create an irreparable breach between Jesus and St. Paul, or to dissociate the Jesus of history from the Christ of the Pauline Epistles is not based on sound arguments,

and is not justified by the evidence of the documents in question. Divergencies there are, but they are neither so numerous or so serious as they are held to be, and do not suffice to destroy the essential continuity between the Master and His Apostle, or to preclude a genuine transmission of the thought of Jesus by St. Paul.

To revert to the question at the commencement of the preceding chapter we may pronounce without any hesitation that there is such a thing as a self-consistent New Testament and a self-consistent Christian religion. There are differences within the New Testament, but there is a unity which is powerful enough to absorb and subdue every distinction, and that unity is found in a common religious relation to Jesus Christ.

We may sum up the controversy, whether we regard it in its English or German form, in some very pregnant words of Dr. J. Denney's.[1] "The most careful scrutiny of the New Testament discloses no trace of any Christianity in which Jesus has any other place than that which is assigned to Him in the faith of the historical Church. Making the fullest allowances for diversities of intellectual, and even of moral, interest which prevail in the different writers and the Christian societies which they address, there is one thing in which they are indistinguishable—in the attitude of their souls to Christ. They all set Him in the same incomparable place. While His true manhood is unquestionably assumed He is set as unquestionably on the side of reality which we call Divine and which confronts men."

[1] Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 373.

CHAPTER V

CHRIST IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY (*contd.*)

THE "CHRIST-MYTH"

LITERATURE FOR CHAPTER V.

J. M. Robertson, *Christianity and Mythology.* 1901.
Pagan Christs. Second edition, 1911.
Jensen, *Das Gilgameschepos in der Weltliteratur.* 1906.
Moses, Jesus, und Paulus. 1909.
Kalthoff, *Das Christus-Problem.* 1903.
Die Entstehung des Christentums. 1904.
Loisy, *L'Évangile et l'Église.* 1904.
Les Évangiles synoptiques. Two vols., 1908.
Pfleiderer, *The Early Conception of Christianity.* 1905. E.T.
F. C. Conybeare, *Myth, Magic, and Morals.* 1909.
J. Weiss, *Jesus von Nazareth / Mythus oder Geschichte?* 1910.
Von Soden, *Has Jesus Lived?* 1911. E.T.
Drews, *The Christ-Myth.* 1911. E.T.
Estlin Carpenter, *The Historical Jesus and Theological Christ.* 1911.
T. H. Thorburn, *Jesus the Christ; Historical or Mythical.* 1912.
J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough.* Third edition, Parts I.-VI., 1911–1913.

THE contention that a considerable portion of the Gospel narrative is mythical in character is neither fresh nor original, and was by no means an uncommon feature in the criticism of the Gospels about the middle of the last century. This semi-mythical theory which had Strauss for its chief exponent, still has its adherents, and among them may be found some of the best-known critical scholars of our generation, such as the late Dr. Pfleiderer of Berlin, Loisy, and F. C. Conybeare. Within the present century, however, a new school has arisen which has

representatives in this country, in America, and in Germany, which is not content with reducing to myth some of the elements in the story of the life and work of Jesus as told in the Gospels, but goes to the extreme length of insisting that no such person as the historic Jesus ever existed. The Jesus of the Gospels is merely a mythical deity humanised and personified, provided with a historic base and environment in Palestine, and credited with a mass of teaching which He in no way originated but which was current at that period, and more especially in those circles with which He has been associated by Christian history and belief.

Before we proceed to discuss the more extreme theory a word or two concerning the intermediate stage occupied by the semi-mythical school may prove helpful.

The best known English representative is the Oxford scholar, Mr. F. C. Conybeare, who, in his book entitled *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, while raising no doubts as to the historic existence of Jesus, attributes some of the most conspicuous features in the Gospel story to the influence of current mythology. Thus in connection with the *Baptism of Jesus*, the Dove, the Voice from heaven, and the age of Jesus (thirty years) are all mythical in origin.

The *Virgin Birth* is a stock legend of antiquity and is related of a number of ancient celebrities, such as Plato, Julius Caesar, and Perseus. The *story of the Baptist* is simply a repetition of that of Samson, which itself clearly belongs to the world of legend. The term *Son of God*, as applied to Jesus in the Gospels, originally meant no more than the Servant of God or Messiah, and it was not until Christianity was spread

among pagans, who were accustomed to the idea of deified Kings and Emperors, that the deification of Jesus became possible.[1]

Mr. Conybeare's views on the provenance of the Christian sacraments will be referred to in a later chapter.

The views of the late Dr. Pfleiderer may be gathered from the following quotation: "It is the great and abiding credit of the scientific theology of the nineteenth century that it has learnt to distinguish between the Christ of faith and the man Jesus of history, two entities which have been identified by ecclesiastical dogma. By means of careful and toilsome investigation it has been shown how the dogma of the God-man gradually took form, precipitated as it were from the intermingling of religious ideas of various origin with the reminiscences of the early Church concerning the life of the Master."[2] In the course of the book from which the above paragraph has been cited he develops the theory, and finally arrives at the conclusion that Christianity belongs not to the region of historical reality but to that of mythology, and that as one of the world's most striking mythologies it must be studied, not in isolation, but in relationship to the myths and legends of universal history, with which it has much in common and to which it owes most of its characteristic elements. The third and last representative of this school to whom we shall refer is Loisy, the French Roman Catholic Modernist.

In his critical work on the "Synoptic Gospels," speaking of the narrative of the *Death and Resurrection*

[1] F. C. Conybeare, *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, pp. 166-169.
[2] Pfleiderer, *The Early Conception of Christianity*, p. 7.

of Jesus, he maintains that the death only is historical, and that no details are authentic beyond the fact that he died with a loud cry on His lips, and was buried by the soldiers in the common grave. The whole narrative after that rests upon no historical foundation (vol. i. 221-223).[1] The facts connected with the *miracles* are greatly exaggerated, and the details in most cases quite unreliable. Jesus may have performed a number of cures in the case of those affected by nervous disorders, and there is little room to doubt that he exercised an abnormal influence upon those "possessed with devils." The other miracles may be dismissed as unauthentic. The whole narrative of the *institution of the Lord's Supper* is due to St. Paul, and the only basis for it lies in the supper held at Bethany, where Jesus promised that His disciples should share in the Messianic Feast (vol. ii. 541).

The stories of the Virgin Birth, the visits of the Magi, Christ's visit to the Temple, are all pious fictions which originated on Gentile soil (vol. i. 197). He attributes much of the Gospel story to the influence of symbolism, and contends that many of the most important incidents related in it are mere picturesque symbols of spiritual truth. Among these may be placed such incidents as the miraculous draught of fishes, the raising of the widow's son at Nain, the feeding of the five thousand, the two thieves on the Cross, and the details concerning the two sisters, Mary and Martha.

Thus, in the main, Loisy leaves us with a Jesus of whom little or nothing can be affirmed with any historical certainty, and the details of whose life and work practically dissolve in mist. In an earlier

[1] The numbers in brackets refer to the pages in *Les Évangiles synoptiques*.

volume, *L'Évangile et l'Église*, he makes several astonishing statements such as that "truth in the strict sense of the word cannot be claimed for the Gospel of Jesus, and it is valuable only for the inspiring and sustaining of religious life." He, therefore, practically advocates a divorce of faith from fact. The great central doctrines of Christianity, the atonement and the resurrection, belong not to the realm of fact but to that of faith, and the value of the Christian creed is based not so much upon the reality of the facts underlying it as upon its utility for the religious life. The original content of the Gospel is discredited by criticism and is, therefore, not available for use as a standard of judgment for the subsequent developments. These, therefore, cannot be appraised from the point of view of their historicity, but only from that of their achievements in the later work and history of the Christian religion, which to Loisy meant the Roman Church. This is also practically the standpoint of George Tyrrell in his last book, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*.

Dr. K. Anderson arrives at much the same conclusion in an article in the *Hibbert Journal* for January 1911, where he argues that as religion lives, moves, and has its being in eternal idea and ideals, it may be absolutely indifferent to historical facts. The living Christ remains only as the symbol of the divine life in man, but has no connection with the historical Jesus, whose existence is to be regarded as of no significance and of no value for religion.

The "Christ-Myth" Theory.—We now propose to deal with the "Christ-Myth" theory, which is claimed to be the one and only logical outcome of the critical methods of the "historico-scientific"

school, and to be the natural development of the views of the semi-mythical group we have just discussed. Here there is no attempt at compromise, and the whole Gospel story is relegated to the realm of myth and fiction. The Gospels have no claim to be regarded as history, and the Jesus portrayed in them is purely a creature of the fancy. The most prominent advocate of the theory in our own country is Mr. J. M. Robertson, a strong supporter of the Rationalist Press Association, a member of Parliament, and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade in the present Government. In America the school is represented by W. B. Smith, while in Germany the writings of Jensen, Kalthoff, and Drews, who approach the question from different standpoints but are agreed as to the non-historicity of the Jesus of the Gospels, have attracted such an amount of attention that the main body of Christological literature in that country has been almost entirely devoted to the discussion of the views of these scholars.

A somewhat detailed synopsis of the ideas and contentions of these various writers is necessary in order to place the reader in a position to gain a fairly clear view of the theory as a whole.

JENSEN.—We will begin with Jensen, who, although he finally arrives at exactly the same conclusion as the other members of the school with regard to the main point at issue, viz. that Jesus never existed, does so by means of a path entirely peculiar to himself. Jensen, who comes from Breslau, is one of the most renowned of modern Assyriologists, and it is from the point of view of the Assyriologist that he approaches this problem. He believes that he can trace the larger part of Christ's history and some

portions of His teaching to an Israelitish form of the "Gilgamesh Epic," a poem supposed to have been in existence two thousand years before the Christian era, dealing with the adventures of Gilgamesh, King of Erech in S. Babylonia, and his friend Eabani. In this story there is to be found, according to him, the original basis of the greater part of the Old Testament. Proceeding upon this assumption he derives the most important of the Old Testament characters from the Epic, and through these characters he professes to trace back such personalities as Jesus, John the son of Zebedee, John the Baptist, and Lazarus to their primitive sources. His theory is set forth in two works, *Das Gilgameschepos in der Weltliteratur*, published in 1906, and *Moses, Jesus, und Paulus*, published in 1910. In the latter of these he seeks to show that Moses, Jesus, and Paul are only variants of the Babylonian God-man Gilgamesh.

John the Baptist is also traced back to a character in the Epic through Elijah, and also through Samson and Samuel, both of whom were, like the Baptist, ascetics who drank no wine.

The same process is also postulated with regard to Jesus through the medium of Joshua, whose name wherever it occurs in the Old Testament betokens Gilgamesh. On the same principle many of the most salient incidents in the life of Jesus become mere repetitions of so-called parallel incidents recorded in the saga. Among these are the Baptism of Jesus by the Baptist, which is modelled upon the royal honours paid by Eabani to Gilgamesh, the flight into the desert, the mission of the twelve, the feeding of the five thousand, Jesus' friendship with St. John, the destruction of the herd of swine, the transfigura-

tion, and the whole story of the Passion and the Resurrection. In consequence of what Jensen is pleased to call his epoch-making discovery he is impelled to throw overboard the whole of the New Testament as possessing no historical value. Jesus Himself is a purely mythical being who never had any objective existence, and the same is necessarily true of St. Paul. The Pauline Epistles must, therefore, be mere forgeries, and the narrative in the Acts is quite devoid of any historical foundation.

This theory is so preposterous in many of its aspects that it is difficult to approach it with any degree of seriousness. I will, therefore, only offer a few general suggestions which seem *prima facie* to deprive it of any weight and importance, and justify us in extending to it the same measure of courtesy as Jensen himself has extended to the documents of the New Testament.

1. First of all the parallel breaks down at the critical point, because there is nothing in the Passion story which has the faintest echo in the Epic of Gilgamesh.

2. Most of Jensen's comparisons, upon which the validity of the theory depends, are concerned with incidents which, speaking generally, are only of secondary interest, and are in no way central or essential in the life of Jesus. Moreover, in the case of these comparatively negligible details there is not a single instance where his derivation is demonstrably necessary or even plausible.

3. Even if we allow that some of his parallels are valid it by no means follows that the whole of the Gospel story is purely mythical. It is possible, but not probable, that some features from the "Gilgamesh

Epic" may have crept into the Gospel narrative through the medium of Judaism, but it is quite a different matter to ask us to believe that the whole life and personality of Jesus are to be traced to such a shadowy source, or that the whole Gospel story is pure legend, as Jensen would have us believe.

4. Whatever may be said as to the historical existence of Jesus, the attempt to resolve St. Paul into a mythical personage breaks down absolutely in view of the " we-sections " in the Acts.[1]

KALTHOFF.—Kalthoff, who is also like Jensen a German scholar of repute, has a theory all his own as to the true origin of Christianity, which may be formulated in his own words: " The picture of Christ in all its main features is ready before a single line of the Gospels was written. Philosophy produced the framework of a universal world view into which the picture of Christ was inserted. The economic conditions of Rome brought together the explosive material which was discharged in Christianity, and in the religious brotherhoods were given the organising forces which combine all the tendencies of the time in the actual structures of the Christian communities."

Kalthoff, then, explains the origin of Christianity purely on the lines of social and economic motives, and not with reference to the historical personality of Jesus Christ. He admits that among the many thousands of those crucified in the time of the Gospels there certainly must have been a Jesus who in the spirit of prophetic piety closed his martyr-life, but adds that it is impossible to attach any real importance to His personality, or to grant Him any essential

[1] See Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, pp. 286-287.

meaning in our interpretation of the origin of the Christian religion. The Christ of the Gospels is simply the consciousness of the Christian community personified and objectified, and the factors in its formation can be shown in the common life of the age. Christianity is, in essence, a new social movement upon a large scale, and its history and success are to be explained mainly, if not solely, in connection with this special quality.[1]

W. B. Smith, J. M. Robertson, and Drews.—Jensen and Kalthoff did not start on their quest with the deliberate object of finding in Jesus of Nazareth a mythical being, although they both practically reached that conclusion, the one through his study of the "Epic of Gilgamesh" and the other through his alleged discovery of the real origin of Christianity in the social forces of the age. The three writers whose views will now be noticed start with the assumption that Jesus never did, and never could have existed, and proceed to interpret the birth and history of the Christian religion on that assumption.

W. B. Smith.—W. B. Smith is an American professor whose work on the *Pre-Christian Jesus* received the all but unique honour of being translated into German, and attracted to itself more attention in its new guise than it had in its original English form. The main object of the book is to prove the existence of a widespread pre-Christian cult of a Divine Jesus. His main arguments have been reproduced and expanded by Robertson and Drews, and as they will be discussed when we come to deal with these writers they need not detain us here.

J. M. Robertson.—J. M. Robertson between 1900

[1] See Kalthoff, *Das Christus-Problem, passim.*

and 1903 published several works, the most important of which are *Christianity and Mythology* and *Pagan Christs*. One cannot attempt to give more than a brief summary of the more important contentions contained in these volumes. His main attitude may perhaps be best illustrated in the following quotation: "A cult associated with the quasi-historic name of Jesus emerges at the beginning of the Christian era which may be connected with an actual historic person, an elusive figure of a Jesus who appears to have been put to death by stoning and hanging about a century before the death of Herod. On the other hand, the name of Jesus in its Hebrew and Aramaic forms had probably an ancient divine status, being borne by the mythic deliverer Joshua and again by the Quasi-Messianic High Priest of the Restoration. It was thus, in every respect, fitted to be the name of a new Demi-God who should combine in himself the two qualities of the Akkadian Deliverer-Messiah and the sacrificial God of the most popular cults of the Graeco-Roman, Egyptian, and West Asiatic world" (91).[1]

He develops the connection of Jesus still further by asserting that the Joshua of the Hexateuch was quite unhistorical, being only the Sun-God, an ancient deity like Moses or Samson, latterly reduced to human status. He also refers to a remarkable Persian tradition which makes Joshua to be a son of Miriam (Mary) (162). The death of a Jesus ben Pandira who was stoned and hanged at Lydda on the eve of the Passover in the reign of Janneus about 100 B.C. is related on the strength of a reference in the Talmud (184).

[1] The figures in brackets refer to the pages in *Pagan Christs*.

The connection of Jesus with Nazareth is also stated to be quite unhistorical, and is supposed by Mr. Robertson to have arisen in one of two ways :

(*a*) From Isaiah xi. 1, "A Branch shall grow out of his roots," a text which is sometimes thought to underlie St. Matthew's quotation in chap. ii. 23, where the Hebrew word *neser*, "branch," seems to be used with a Messianic import. According to him there existed a Messianic sect called the Nasrites or Branchists, falsely interpreted at a later time as followers of a man of Nazareth.

(*b*) By a confusion between the two words Nazarite and Nazarene. The prophecy quoted by St. Matthew alluded to above reads, "He shall be called a Nazaraios." Now this has no local reference to any such place as Nazareth, and can only mean "Nazarite," a member of an ascetic sect familiar in the Old Testament.

The principal features in the Gospel picture of Jesus are explained with reference to contemporary religious cults.

The Sonship of Christ.—In this respect Christ falls into line with the gods of the Greek and Oriental worships. Apollo and Athene, Attis and Dionysus, all had to become the children of Zeus ; Mithra was the son of Ahura-Mazda, and so the Judaeo-Greek Logos had to become the son of Jehovah (95-97).

The Passion Story.—The story of the Crucifixion has been built from the practices and ritual of human sacrifices. In particular it may be traced to the ancient Semitic human sacrifice as represented by the slaying of the Kronian victim in the island of Rhodes. In the original myth Kronos, "whom the Phoenicians call Israel," sacrificed his son Ieoud,

after putting on him royal robes, but in the sacrificial rites, as maintained well into historic times, the place of Ieoud was taken by a criminal already condemned to death, who would thus figure as the "son of the father" (Barabbas) clad in royal robes. Here also, as in the Crucifixion story, the prisoner was led to suffer outside the gates of the city, and the parallel is completed by identifying the name Ieoud with Judah or Jew.[1]

The most striking feature in Robertson's theory is, however, the contention that the Gospel narrative of the Passion and Resurrection is only the reproduction of a *Mystery play*, on the lines of what is alleged to be an essential feature in the religions of Greece, Egypt, and Syria, where the central episodes in the stories of suffering and dying gods and goddesses were dramatically represented. Thus in the worship of Adonis and of Attis there was a dramatic representation of the dead god by effigy and of his resurrection, and in the mysteries of Mithra as known in the Graeco-Roman world there appears to have been included a representation of the burial of a stone effigy of the god in a rock tomb, and of his resurrection.

So again in the Thracian cult of Dionysus there was a symbolic representation of the dismemberment of the young god by the Titans, and in the Eleusinian mysteries the dramatic representation of the loss of Persephone, the mourning of the mother Demeter,

[1] It is interesting to note that in the latest edition of Part VI. of "The Golden Bough" (*The Scapegoat*) (Macmillan, 1913) Dr. Frazer has relegated to the appendix the chapter in which he recognises in the crucified Jesus the vegetation-god annually slain on the Sacred Tree, and that he now speaks of the identification with diminished confidence. Much of Mr. Robertson's work, in which he laid considerable emphasis on what he regarded as the definite outcome of Dr. Frazer's investigation, must now be recast in view of the latter's modification of his former position.

and the restoration of the daughter was the principal attraction. Mr. Robertson maintains that his conception of the story of the Last Supper, Passion, Betrayal, Trial, and Crucifixion as a dramatic representation and not a record of actual facts is supported by the Gospel narrative itself, where the dramatic element is patent to the careful reader. The features of the story, the impossible huddling of the action, the crowding of the betrayal and trial into one night, can only be explained by realising that we are reading the bare transcription of a Mystery play, of which another and later example is found in the *Acts of Pilate* (194-205). He claims to have found evidence that the play was first publicly performed in Egypt.

His views of the *Christian Sacraments* are much on a level with those we shall have to discuss in a later chapter in connection with the "Mystery Religions." The Eucharist is the climax of a long process of development which, starting with the eating of human sacrifices, passed through several stages, in which the god is represented as either present at the feast, or as being actually consumed in the person of the victim, ideas which are alleged to be essential in the conception of the Christian ordinance.

The Dependence of Christianity on Mithraism.—In discussing the relationship of Christianity to the surrounding "Mystery Religions," Mr. Robertson claims that the former is considerably indebted to the cult of Mithra [1] for much that is essential in its system. Thus the mysteries of the burial and resurrection of Jesus, Lord, Mediator, and Saviour, the burial in a rock tomb, the resurrection from that

[1] For a short account of Mithraism see Chapter VII.

tomb, the sacrament of bread and water, the marking of the forehead with a mystic mark, all these were in practice before Christian times. There were also in Mithraism foreshadowings of the Cross, and the Lamb of God was a god-symbol from remote antiquity. In asserting for Christ birth from a Virgin-mother and the Most High God Christianity was simply imitating Mithraism, and this is largely true of the system as a whole. The ultimate displacement of Mithraism by Christianity is attributed by Mr. Robertson not to any innate superiority in the latter, but to the fortuitous chance that at the critical moment of the death of Julian his successor happened to be a Christian and not a follower of Mithra. Even then Mithraism was not so much overthrown as transformed and absorbed by Christianity. The adoption of the latter as the religion of the Empire was an instance of the " survival of the fittest " only as far as it was adapted to the population of a decaying State, in which ignorance and subjection were slowly corroding alike intelligence and character. Christianity was superior to Mithraism because it had sedulously copied every one of its rivals and developed special features of its own. Its principal attraction, however, consisted in the fact that its God was humanised in the most literal way, and this satisfied the desire of the multitude for a concrete Deity. The Gospels gave a literal story : the Divine man was a carpenter, and ate and drank with the poorest of the people. Christianity was, therefore, essentially a religion for the dark ages, for the northern peoples which had not gone through the Pagan evolution of cults and symbolisms and mysteries, and whose own traditional faith was too vague and primitive to hold its ground

against the elaborate theology and ritual of the new religion. The hold of the Christian faith creed over the people was a matter of concrete and narrative appeal to everyday intelligence. The fatal weakness of Mithraism as against Christianity was that its organisation was esoteric and, therefore, could never take hold of the ignorant masses. It was always a sort of freemasonry and never a public institution, whereas the Christian Church renewed the spell of Imperial Rome and brought actual force to make good intellectual weakness (328-330).

It would be difficult to conceive a paragraph more open to criticism than the above, wherein Mr. Robertson seeks to account for the permanence of Christianity as compared with the cult of Mithra. With regard to his main contention, the denial of the existence of the historic Jesus, he seems to give away the whole case. He acknowledges that the strength of the Christian appeal lay in its foundation upon a concrete narrative and a supposed historic Jesus, as against the avowedly mythical origin of Mithra. But surely the real source of the supremacy of the Christian religion, that which explains its victory over all the contemporary rival cults, is nothing else than the absolute historicity of its Founder, and if, in the ultimate issue, Jesus had stood on the same plane as Mithra, Attis, or Osiris, Christianity must soon have been numbered with the other religions which have perished and are now buried in oblivion.

Again, Mr. Robertson cannot have it both ways. If Christianity owed its success merely because it was best fitted to the population of the decaying Empire in which ignorance and subjection had destroyed intelligence and character, it could not possibly have

commended itself to the virile barbarian of the north, flushed with victory, and filled with contempt for the decadent Roman of the Empire. His history is also sadly at fault in some particulars. It was Christianity that was exclusive and not Mithraism. The one reiterated charge against it was that Christ would not take His place in the Pantheon among the gods of the nations, while within the cult of Mithra there was found room for all the gods of the Empire. His assertion that the ultimate success of Christianity was due to the use of force in supplementing its intellectual weakness is untrue to facts. Christianity was not the only religion in Imperial Rome on behalf of which the temporal power was exercised at one time or another. For three centuries the Christian faith was subjected to violence, and the whole power of the State was often exerted to destroy its very existence. But the more it was persecuted the stronger it grew, while the religions of Mithra and Isis withered and died at the very breath of persecution. Christianity survived and conquered because behind it lay the reality of the historic Jesus, and because, while absolutely exclusive as to the place and character of its Divine Founder, it proclaimed a salvation for all, a salvation in which the unwarlike Roman as well as the warrior barbarian found what he needed.

Drews.—Drews published his book on the *Christ-Myth* in 1910, and an English translation appeared in 1911. He follows closely in the footsteps of Robertson, more especially in his contention that primitive Christianity is purely the result of syncretism, an amalgam of Babylonian, Persian, Hellenistic, and Judaistic ideas. Like Smith and Robertson

he postulates a pre-Christian Jewish cult of Jesus, under the name of Joshua, whom he alleges to have been a god of healing, and to have had some affinity with Iasios or Iason (*ἰᾶσθαι*), the pupil of Chiron. He claims to have found traces of this pre-Christian god Joshua in the Apocalypse and also in the *Didache* (57-62).[1] Like them he also refers many if not most of the more important narratives of the Gospel to a mythical origin. Thus the stories which relate to the birth of Jesus and His early fortunes date back to centuries before Christ. Traces of the birth-myth are found in Revelation xii., which tells of the birth of a divine child who is scarcely born before he is threatened by the Dragon of Darkness, and this, according to Gunkel, comes from a very early Babylonian source. With this may be compared also the Greek myth of Leto, and similar stories told of the gods, sons of gods, heroes, and kings, as *e.g.* Zeus, Attis, Dionysus, Romulus and Remus, and Augustus (88-89).

The story of the Transfiguration is only another view of the story of the Light-God and Fire-God such as lies also at the root of the story of the Baptism of Jesus, where the thought of the new birth of the Saviour is associated with that of the Baptism of Jesus, and connected with it is the thought of the fire-baptism of which the sun partakes at the height of his power (127).

The Cross in Christianity.—The conception of Christ put to death on the Cross is, comparatively speaking, a late one. The connection of Christ with the Cross was originally not a reproduction of the manner of His death, but it rather symbolises, as in

[1] The numbers in brackets refer to the pages in *The Christ-Myth.*—E.T.

the ancient mysteries, the victory of the Christian cult-god over death—the idea of resurrection and life (160).

St. Paul's Evidence.—He devotes a considerable portion of his book to the discussion of the Pauline evidence for the historical existence of Jesus. He is not quite ingenuous in his treatment of the Pauline letters, and is apt to get rid of disconcerting statements either by accepting the most extreme critical judgments and relegating the letters to the middle of the second century, or by asserting that these particular statements have been interpolated in the original text. A striking example of this tendency is seen in his rejection of St. Paul's reference to " James, the Lord's brother." Here he takes refuge behind three lines of defence: (1) " Brother " is used in the sense of " follower " and does not imply any family relationship. (2) The passage is an interpolation. (3) The Epistle is not an authentic letter of St. Paul's and belongs to the second century. This process reminds us of that in vogue in a modern court of law in the case of an action for libel where several lines of defence are submitted, so that if one or more fail the defendant may ultimately find safety behind what is left.

His main argument is, however, that the Pauline letters are spurious and belong to the next century and that there is, therefore, really nothing of a definite nature to be learnt from them about the historical Jesus. He enters, however, upon a long discussion of the value of the Apostle's evidence and of his conception of Christ on the assumption that the letters are genuine Pauline documents and comes to the conclusion that the Christ of St. Paul had no real or necessary connection with any historic person-

age. His argument runs somewhat as follows. When the Apostle refers to the words and opinions of "the Lord" as authoritative we have to do not with the actual words of a historic Person but with mere rules of a community such as were current and had a canonical significance everywhere in religious unions as "Words of the Master," and more especially among the Pythagoreans. St. Paul in Tarsus was accustomed to the idea of a young and beautiful god who reanimated nature by his death, and to popular legends connected with his violent end and glorious resurrection; and not only in Tarsus, but throughout the Graeco-Roman world, there was a yearly celebration, in the most impressive manner, of the feast of this god, called according to the particular locality, Tammuz, Adonis, Attis, Dionysus, or Osiris. This celebration was particularly magnificent at Syrian Antioch, where Christianity is said to have made its first approach to the Gentile world, and the Gospel as taught by St. Paul was in origin, therefore, nothing but a Judaised and spiritualised Adonis cult.

St. Paul never preached the man Jesus, and there was no necessity for him to have done so. He preached to the Gentiles the heavenly, spiritual Being, Christ, a conception which presented no difficulties to them and which needed no proof of the manhood of a historic Jesus either to strengthen or guarantee its truth. St. Paul, therefore, did little more than place the old idea of the representative self-sacrifice of God in a new setting, a development of the religion of Jesus for which no historical personality was needed. Even if we regard St. Paul as the first literary witness to Christianity and as responsible for its establishment as a new religion differing from

Judaism as well as for the teaching on which the whole future development of Christian thought depended, he knew nothing of Jesus as a historical personality. It is only because we read the Gospels before the Epistles, and not in the reverse order, as they ought to be read, that we infer that the Jesus that meets us in the latter is a real man. For St. Paul Christ as the principle is only an allegorical and symbolical personality, such as were the heathen deities who passed as general cosmic powers without prejudice to their appearing in human form. He did not make Christ the bearer and mediator of redemption because he so highly esteemed and revered Jesus as a historic Person, but because he knew nothing of Him as such. It is ridiculous to expect that a man like St. Paul could have connected such tremendous conceptions with a human individual as he does with Christ. Christ's life and death are for the Apostle neither the moral achievements of a man nor in any way historical facts, but super-historical facts in the super-sensible world (174-208).

The Teaching of Jesus.—Drews is not content with deriving the incidents of the life and work of Jesus from current mythology, but must needs treat much of His teaching on the same principle and deny to it any originality or unique value. Thus the parables of the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son, and the Sower are borrowed partly from Jewish philosophy, partly from the oral tradition afterwards preserved in the Talmud, and partly from other sources. The Sermon on the Mount is a mere patchwork taken from ancient Jewish literature, and even the Lord's Prayer contains not a single thought which has not its prototype in the Old Testament or in the ancient

philosophical maxims of the Jewish people. Jesus, therefore, neither said nor taught anything beyond the purer morality of contemporary Judaism, to say nothing of the Stoics and of other ethical teachers of antiquity, specially those of the Indies (252-254).

How the Jesus of the Gospels originated.—According to Drews the Jesus of the Gospels was the creation of the "Twelve" for the purpose of buttressing their position against St. Paul. It was in order to shut the door of the Apostolate in the face of the claims of St. Paul as the Apostle of the Gentiles that they set up the condition that a true "Apostle" must be one who had seen and heard Jesus himself, and a Jesus was therefore invented for the purpose. The Jesus of the Gospels is in reality, however, nothing but the expression of the consciousness of the community, as Kalthoff had already contended, and the life of Jesus is merely the historical garb in which the metaphysical ideas, the religious hopes, and the outer and inner experiences of the community which had Jesus for its cult-god are represented (264).

Summary of Drews' Position.—The following is a brief summary of Drews' general attitude towards Christianity and the historic Christ.

Christianity is a syncretistic religion. It belongs to those multiform religious movements which at the commencement of our era were struggling with one another for the mastery. Setting out from the apocalyptic ideas among the Jewish sects it was borne on the tide of a mighty social agitation which found its centre and its point of departure in the religious sects and Mystery communities. Its adherents conceived the Messiah not merely as the Saviour of souls but as the deliverer from slavery,

from the lot of the poor and oppressed, and as the bearer of new justice. It borrowed its chief doctrine, the central idea of God sacrificing Himself for mankind, from the neighbouring peoples, and it came into existence in Syrian Antioch, the principal seat of the worship of Adonis (209).

Speaking of the *Christ of the Gospels* he maintains that the Synoptic Christ, in whom modern theology thinks it finds the characteristics of the historical Jesus, stands not a hair's breadth nearer to a human interpretation than the Christ of the fourth Gospel. Jesus, the Christ, the Saviour, the Deliverer, the Physician of oppressed souls, has been from first to last a figure borrowed from myth, to whom the desire for redemption and the naïve faith of the western Asiatic peoples have transferred all their conceptions of the soul's welfare (229). The "history" of this Jesus in all its general characteristics had been determined long before the evangelical Jesus claimed historical existence.

The parts of the Gospel containing the narrative of the Last Supper, Passion, and Resurrection owe their origin mainly to cult symbolism and to the myth of the dying and rising Saviour of the western Asiatic religions. There was no invention necessary, because the story in all its details was ready at hand. The mocking, scourging, the two thieves, the cry from the Cross, the soldiers casting dice, the women at the place of execution and at the grave, the grave in a rock, are found just in the same form in the worship of Adonis, Attis, Mithra, and Osiris. The Saviour carrying His Cross is copied from Hercules. Christ takes exactly the same place in the religious-social brotherhood which is named after Him as Adonis

has in the Syrian, Osiris in the Egyptian, and Dionysus in the Greek cult associations, and there is as much real foundation for His historic existence as there is for theirs.

No attempt will be made here to enter upon anything like an exhaustive criticism of the "Christ-Myth" theory as a whole, nor of its details as developed by its various exponents. There have been issued from the press in Germany publications by the score condemning the theory root and branch, and in its extreme form it has enlisted but little support. The best of the German criticisms is perhaps Johannes Weiss's *Jesus von Nazareth, Mythus oder Geschichte?* In English a fairly adequate reply to Drews will be found in Dr. Thorburn's recently published volume, *Jesus the Christ, Historical or Mythical.* It is only necessary here to emphasise the strength of the evidence for the existence of a historic Jesus and the essential difference between Christianity and all the rival religious cults in this one respect. The birth of Christianity and the personality of its Founder are definitely located within historic times and in historical surroundings, a feature which is absolutely lacking in any of the contemporary religious cults with the possible exception of the cult of Orpheus. It is a significant fact that the one incident in the Gospel story which enables us to decide approximately the year of the Crucifixion, viz. the trial before Pontius Pilate, is also the one fact mentioned in profane history, not indeed quite contemporaneous with the event, but near enough to be of first-rate historical value. Tacitus expressly mentions the crucifixion of one Jesus during the governorship of Pilate. Whether the "Chrestus" of Suetonius refers to

Christ is not quite certain, and his evidence, although suggestive, is nothing like so valuable as that of Tacitus. Trypho and Celsus, whose opinions have reached us indirectly, those of Trypho through Justin Martyr and of Celsus through Origen, although both strenuous opponents of Christianity, never make the slightest attempt to throw suspicion upon the historic existence of its Founder.

The strongest and most irrefragable evidence of all is provided by the existence and history of the Christian Church. If the "Christ-Myth" theory is true, and if Jesus never lived, the whole civilised world has for close upon two thousand years lain under the spell of a lie, and the greatest power for good that the world has ever known originated in a delusion.

The main details of the theory are as weak as the general evidence for the existence of Jesus is strong. There is, *e.g.*, not a tittle of evidence of anything approaching a cult or deification of Joshua. Ideas of this character were associated with some of the great Old Testament names, as *e.g.* Elijah, but there is no trace of anything of the kind in the case of Joshua. Again, it is difficult to explain the connection of the alleged cult with the name Jesus, because this is never in the Gospels associated with any Messianic prophecy. There are names such as Shiloh, Emmanuel, David, with Messianic traditions attached to them, and a myth would surely have connected itself with a name of this class and not with the name of Jesus which has no Messianic associations in its favour.

It may possibly be true that the Gospel narrative of the Death and Resurrection was derived from a Mystery play, but even so this does not necessarily

mean that the characters in the play were not real historic personages, as Mystery plays in which definite historical events were commemorated were by no means uncommon.

Professor Margoliouth in an article in the *Expositor* for December 1904 has conclusively proved that Mr. Robertson's arguments for the unhistorical character of our Lord's connection with Nazareth are utterly untenable on linguistic grounds. He also points out how Mr. Robertson in his reference to the story of the death of Jesus, son of Pandira, places more reliance upon oral tradition preserved in the Talmud which, at the very earliest, was not committed to writing before the fifth century, than upon the Christian tradition which is acknowledged by the most extreme critics to have been reduced to writing not later than the middle of the second century.

Professor Margoliouth also shows that the whole story in the Talmud is only a medley of Gospel facts and the fancies of the Rabbis, and that Pandira is only another name for Peter.

The argument of Drews and of the others with regard to the Pauline conception of Christ and the Apostle's entire lack of knowledge of any incidents connected with a historic Jesus has been dealt with fully in the preceding chapter and need not detain us here. The relationship of primitive and Pauline Christianity to the Mystery cults upon which the "Christ-Myth" theory is largely based will engage our attention in the chapter upon "St. Paul and the Mystery Religions." Two points only need to be emphasised here:

1. The exponents of this theory have assumed a much more detailed and complete knowledge of the

" Mystery Religions " than is justified by the materials available.

2. Most of their supposed parallels between Christianity and the " Mystery cults " are derived from the latter as known in the third and fourth century A.D., and not as they existed when Christianity first came into contact with them. It is therefore quite as plausible to argue that the resemblances are due to the influence of Christianity upon these cults as it is to take the contrary position and trace all that is characteristic in Christianity to these Graeco-Roman religions.

We may close this chapter with two very salutary cautions.

1. We are not to infer an influence from an analogy (Cumont).

2. Resemblance does not necessarily presuppose imitation (Schweitzer).

The study of Comparative Religions has undoubtedly brought to light a certain amount of correspondence of Christian practice and Christian belief with Pagan ceremonies and beliefs, but even then not to anything like the extent alleged by the members of the " Christ-Myth " school. To argue that an event is not historical because analogies are discovered in certain mythological systems is not sound reasoning. Christianity may have adopted certain features which were the common property of the current religions of the age, but this in no way demands or makes it reasonably probable that the whole Christian system was mythical in its origin, or that its Divine Founder had no historic existence.

CHAPTER VI

CHRIST IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY (*contd.*)

THE CHRIST OF ESCHATOLOGY

LITERATURE FOR CHAPTER VI.

R. H. Charles' Editions of *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Ethiopic Enoch, Slavonic Enoch, Ascension of Isaiah, Book of Jubilees. 1893–1912.*

Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian. 1900.

Schürer, *History of the Jewish People.* 1885. E.T.

Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter.* 1902.

Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus.* 1910. E.T.

Von Dobschütz, *The Eschatology of the Gospels.* 1910.

C. W. Emmet, *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels.* 1910.

E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah.* 1910.

E. C. Dewick, *Primitive Eschatology.* 1912.

Foundations, by Seven Oxford Tutors. 1912.

The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Edited by R. H. Charles. 1913.

Articles on "Eschatology" in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* and in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*

I

Apocalyptic Literature

THE eschatological question, if not the most difficult and disturbing, is at any rate the most living issue in New Testament criticism and at the present time attracts more general interest than any other subject connected with Biblical studies. The recent emergence of the eschatological problem into unusual prominence is largely due to the eager study of a considerable body of Jewish literature which was

highly appreciated by the early Christian Church but was allowed to fall into neglect and desuetude for close upon 1500 years. It is only within the present century that its significance in connection with the language of the Gospels and the faith of the Church has come to be realised and that it has been allowed to take its place as one of the most important factors in the background of the New Testament. This literature, which is generally known as "apocalyptic," is spread over three centuries, the two preceding and the one following the birth of Christ, and comprises a large number of separate works. Of this number only two books were known in the middle of the last century, viz. the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and 4 Ezra. The labours of scholars, both German and British, have now enormously increased the amount of available apocalyptic material. The pioneers in this field of research were Dillmann, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, and Schürer in Germany, and Rendel Harris, M. R. James, and R. H. Charles in this country. The pride of place must, however, be yielded to Dr. Charles, whose work in this connection is invaluable, and whose editions of most of the books have become the standard authorities on the subject.

A list of the books, arranged chronologically according to the dates given by Dr. Charles,[1] provides us with the following result:

1. *Writings of the Second Century* B.C.

Ethiopian Enoch, chaps. i.-xxxvi.; Ethiopian Enoch, chaps. lxxxiii.-xc.; Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (some apocryphal sections); Sibylline Oracles, The Prœmium and iii. 97-818.

[1] Charles, article "Eschatology," *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. ii. pp. 1335-1336.

To this period must be assigned the Book of Daniel, included in the Old Testament Canon, which is also apocalyptic in character.

2. *Writings of the First Century* B.C.

Ethiopian Enoch, chaps. xci.-civ.; Ethiopian Enoch, chaps. xxxvii.-lxx.; Sibylline Oracles, iii. 1-62; Psalms of Solomon; and 2 Maccabees which is found in the Apocrypha.

3. *Writings of the First Century* A.D.

Book of Jubilees; Assumption of Moses; 4 Maccabees; Apocalypse of Baruch; Slavonic Enoch; the apocryphal books of Wisdom, Esdras, and Baruch.

This enumeration reveals the fact that several of the books are of composite origin. The book of Enoch, *e.g.*, includes sections which belong to each of these three centuries, while the Sibylline Oracles cover a period of at least five centuries. The sections within our purview, however, are the productions of the second and first centuries B.C.

The name of "apocalyptic" is derived from the visionary and ecstatic form of the writings, in which the imagery is often of a very mysterious kind. It is modelled upon the visionary type adopted by Ezekiel and Zechariah. The Book of Daniel supplies a useful example of the type in the Old Testament, and we have the article in its perfected state in the Apocalypse of St. John in the New Testament.

Dr. Charles maintains that, taken as a whole, they represent the views of the Pharisaic Jew of Palestine, with the exception of the Slavonic Book of Enoch, which he describes as a product of Alexandrian Judaism. Friedländer, on the other hand, is of opinion that the main features of the writings suggest a Jewish-Hellenistic origin, while Bousset, who

acknowledges the presence in them of much that is not purely Jewish, attributes the foreign elements to Persian influence. An interesting conjecture is that of Wellhausen, who suggests that we may have in this literature a considerable portion of the secret books of the Essenes.

The Motive of "Apocalyptic."—It is in the effect upon Judaism of the great Maccabean struggle and of the reaction which followed it that we seek for the motive of the apocalyptic literature. The pious Jew of post-exilic days had been nourished upon the teaching of the great prophets of Israel, with its promises of a glorious future for God's people and its emphasis upon the righteousness of God. But as time rolled on and generation succeeded generation the promises showed no sign of fulfilment, and oppression, bondage, and persecution became the unvarying lot of the nation, with the result that doubts and questionings arose as to the validity of promises so irreconcilable with the actual conditions and as to the righteousness of Jehovah who could allow Israel to be continuously trampled under foot by the heathen. This was the situation with which the sages and religious leaders of the period were confronted, and the apocalyptic writings contain their solution of the problem.

The writings are prophecies, but not prophecies in the ordinary sense. The older prophets had *spoken* God's message, the apocalyptic message is expressed in writing only; the prophets were closely concerned with the historical events of their own age, and their conceptions of the future were largely based upon their interpretation of the facts of their own time, but to the apocalyptist the present is hopeless: he finds hope of neither freedom nor glory in this

life or upon this earth. His conception of the glorious future of Israel, therefore, demands a new earth and a new heaven in the world beyond. Because prophecy had ceased with Malachi and because it was well-nigh impossible under conditions so depressing and oppressive to issue a personal appeal with any prospect of ultimate effect upon the nation at large, they had recourse to the great names of the past, and issued their writings under such titles as the Book of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, etc. The books have been aptly called "tracts for the bad times," and their main object was to comfort and console the godly amid circumstances of almost unparalleled oppression and to strengthen the faith in the righteousness of God of those who were sorely tried by the hard and cruel lot to which they were subjected. The content of the teaching contained in the literature may be summed up in the words of Rev. ii. 10, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life."

II

Pre-Christian Eschatology

A short sketch of the development of the eschatological teaching contained in the Old Testament and in the documents belonging to the period following the close of the Canon is necessary before we can realise its relevance and significance in connection with the eschatology of the New Testament.

This pre-Christian eschatology is concerned with two main conceptions :

(*a*) The Kingdom of God, with the cognate ideas of the Judgment and the Resurrection.

(*b*) The Messiah.

(*a*) THE KINGDOM OF GOD.—It will simplify our study of the development of the conception of the Kingdom of God in pre-Christian ages if we divide our main period into four lesser periods, each of which has its characteristic features in connection with our subject. The minor periods will then be as follows :

1. The pre-prophetic. 2. The pre-exilic. 3. The exilic and post-exilic. 4. The apocalyptic.

1. *The Pre-Prophetic Period.*—As we have already intimated the history of the conception of the Kingdom of God is the history of a development. In its earliest stage, in the period preceding the advent of the great prophets, the conception was purely nationalistic, materialistic, and unethical in its character, and was solely confined to the hope and promise of future national prosperity for Israel. Jehovah was the God of Israel only, and the " golden age " of pre-prophetic Israel meant the complete victory which He would grant to the nation over its enemies, a victory that would inaugurate the " Day of Jehovah."

2. *The Pre-Exilic Period.*—The eighth century, which saw the rise of Amos, Micah, and Isaiah, witnessed a marked advance in the conception of the Kingdom. The henotheism of the preceding age was superseded by the monotheism of the great prophets whose great work was to purge the conception of all that was unethical and purely nationalistic. Jehovah was no longer the God of Israel only, but the moral Ruler of the world. All nations were His. The Day of Jehovah was indeed to come, but it was to be a day when the righteousness of the Lord would be revealed *in judgment*, and that judgment would begin with Israel itself (Amos iii. 2). The Kingdom

is still to be established upon the earth and is to be introduced by a judgment which, according to the earlier prophets, is to be confined to the nation, but in the later prophets is to be world-wide and to include all men in its operation. The old nationalistic claims, however, never completely lost their hold upon the people, and some of the prophets themselves never rose superior to the narrow ideals of the earlier ages. In Isaiah, however, who carries the conception to its logical conclusion, we have a glimpse of its future breadth and grandeur where he promises that, after the final judgment, the righteous among the heathen are to share with righteous Israel in the blessings of the Kingdom.

3. *The Exilic and Post-Exilic Period.*—The main characteristic of this period is the growth of individualism. Hitherto the nation and the nation only had been the religious unit, and every promise was bound with the future of the nation. The effect of the terrible events which preceded the exile and of the exile itself, which had meant the destruction of so much that made for nationalism, was to concentrate attention upon the individual as such. Something of this change is also due to the influence of other ideals, more especially those of Persia, with which Judaism was now brought into close contact. Thus there arose the conception of the individual relationship of man to God and of God to man, and with it the corresponding thought of the inwardness of the Kingdom of God (Jer. xxxi. 31-35). As a direct consequence of the prominence assigned to the individual as the religious unit there arose the conviction that the communion of man with God would survive even death, and we now note the shadowy

beginnings of the doctrines of a resurrection and eternal life. Cf. especially Ps. lxxiii. and the Book of Job.

There is a change also in the locality of the Kingdom to be noticed. The scene had hitherto been confined to the present earth, but, according to deutero-Isaiah, the Kingdom will not make its appearance on earth in its present condition, but in a new heaven and a new earth, when the wicked shall have been destroyed and the righteous, of the Gentiles as well as of Israel, shall find a home.

A divergence of views, however, discloses itself in this connection. Ezekiel, although strongly individualistic, still clings to the national conception, and all Gentiles are by him excluded for ever from the Kingdom of God. Jeremiah, on the other hand, includes among those who are to inherit the blessings of the Kingdom all the righteous Gentiles. Ezekiel and Jeremiah may then be described as the founders of two schools of Jewish thought which survived until the Christian era and found their ultimate realisation, the one in the exclusiveness of Judaism and the other in the catholicity of Christianity.

4. *The Apocalyptic Period.* — The vicissitudes through which the Jewish people passed in the centuries following the return from the exile left a deep mark upon the mind and conscience of the nation, and the literature of that period shows upon every line of it the effect of this influence. Despairing of the present and with little or no hope of a blessed future upon earth under any conceivable conditions, the new heaven and new earth of deutero-Isaiah give way to a spiritual heaven in which flesh and blood are to have no part. Chief, however, among the eschato-

logical developments of this period is the emergence of the doctrine of the Resurrection into broad daylight, a doctrine in which the national and individual eschatologies of previous ages become merged into one. The Kingdom of God is to be finally realised in the world to come, when the righteous dead shall arise to share in its glories. The conception of the Day of Jehovah and of the great Judgment, which is to inaugurate the establishment of the spiritual heavenly Kingdom, is also enriched by the addition of further elements. It is to be ushered in by woes and tribulations and physical portents. All social relationships and family ties will be destroyed, and the catastrophic ruin of the present world-order will mark the coming of the Judgment and the end of all things. This aspect of the approach of the Kingdom is illustrated with considerable detail in such writings as the Psalms of Solomon, the Testament of Levi, and the Assumption of Moses.

All the apocalyptic writers agree as to the fact of the Judgment, but there is a considerable divergence of opinion as to its exact position in the order of events. This is due to varying conceptions of the Messianic Kingdom. Thus in the Sibylline Oracles iii. 631-731 we read of a temporary Messianic reign, while in the Book of Enoch we find a synthesis of this view and the other more prevalent view which regarded the Kingdom as final and universal. In this case the Judgment is set at the end of this temporary Messianic Kingdom, to be followed by the coming of the everlasting Kingdom of God in all its power and glory.

(*b*) The Messiah.—The first fact that we have to note in dealing with this aspect of Jewish eschatology is that the Messiah is not an essential factor in the

conception of the Kingdom of God. This is true of the older prophets as well as of the apocryphal and apocalyptic writers. Thus, of the prophets, there is no mention of the Messiah in Amos, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, several post-exilic sections of Isaiah, nor do we find him in Judith, Tobit, Baruch, portions of Ethiopian and Slavonic Enoch, Wisdom, and the Assumption of Moses. We are therefore justified in assuming that Jewish religious leaders were content with a conception of the Kingdom of God in which the Messiah played no part, but which was under the immediate sovereignty of God Himself. With this caveat we will proceed to deal with the writers in whose conception of the coming Kingdom the Messiah, under various aspects, formed an essential feature.

1. *The Messiah as King.*—The Messiah is normally conceived by the prophets of Israel as the ideal King, a scion of David's race, who would restore the traditional glories of David's reign.

2. *The Messiah of Levitic Descent.*—In some of the apocalyptic books as, *e.g.*, in the older sections of the Book of Enoch, Book of Jubilees, the main body of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and in 1 and 2 Maccabees (all belonging to the second century B.C.) the Messianic Son of David is, however, entirely superseded, and the Messiah's descent is no longer traced to Judah but to Levi. (So especially the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.) This change in the Messianic genealogy was due to the effect of the powerful family of the Maccabees, which was itself of Levitic descent, upon the imagination of the writers of the period. This influence made itself felt to such an extent that the Messiah was actually identified

with individual members of that heroic family, and the Messianic hopes were centred successively upon Judas, Jonathan, Simon, and more particularly on John Hyrcanus, who combined in his own person the threefold offices of prophet, priest, and king. (Cf. 1 Macc. and Testament of Levi viii. 18.) The sad decline of the Maccabees in power and moral greatness after the death of John Hyrcanus soon brought about a reaction, and the original conception of a kingly Messiah, a Son of David, reasserted itself and never afterwards lost its pride of place in the eschatological systems of later Judaism.

3. *The Messiah as Warrior Prince.*—Closely connected with the Maccabean restoration, and largely the result of the wonderful achievements of that line of Princes, is the conception of the Messiah as the Warrior Prince, which coloured the ideal of the kingly Messiah in the post-Maccabean period, and was productive of much mischief in the after history of the nation. It laid such firm hold of the imagination of the mass of the people that it almost entirely displaced the Old Testament conception of the Messiah as the Prince of Peace, and was largely responsible for the periodical disturbances and revolts against the tyranny of heathen oppressors of which we have such striking instances in the futile attempt of Theudas and in the final rebellion of Bar-Cochba, both directed against the power of Imperial Rome. The figure of the Messiah as Warrior Prince holds a prominent place in the Psalms of Solomon, where the Messiah is not only the righteous ruler of Israel but also the avenger of the wrongs of God's people on all heathen nations.

4. *The Servant of the Lord.*—This unique Messianic

conception is confined to the great prophet of the exile, deutero-Isaiah, and is in some sense the crowning achievement of Messianic prophecy. The figure of the suffering Servant of the Lord, so full of pathos and beauty, does not seem to have appealed with any great force to the consciousness of the nation, and it is probable that the Messianic significance of the great prophet's ideal was never apprehended prior to the coming of Christ, so that a suffering Messiah remained unintelligible to the mass of the Jewish nation.

5. *The Son of Man.*—The final and most striking development of Messianic doctrine is found in that branch of apocalyptic literature connected with the name of Enoch, and more particularly with one section of the Ethiopian Enoch, chapters xxxvii.-lxx., which is entitled "The Similitudes of Enoch," and is generally dated about 64 B.C. This is a work which was probably well known to our Lord, and is quoted in the Epistle of St. Jude. The writer takes up an allusion in Daniel (Dan. vii. 13) to "one like a Son of Man" who appeared in the clouds of heaven, and building upon this basis proceeds to picture a Messiah of overpowering grandeur and majesty. In the "Similitudes of Enoch" He is no longer "one like the Son of Man," but He is the "Son of Man" in person, a pre-existing, supernatural being, the friend of God from the beginning, who with His angels shall confound the kings of the earth, sit on the throne of God, judge the quick and the dead, and introduce the new era of God's glorious Kingdom. The writer adopts a great deal of the older eschatological matter, the new heaven and the new earth, the eternal punishment of the wicked, and the everlasting Kingdom of God. But the outstanding feature of this eschatological

scheme is the *central figure*, the pre-existent, supernatural Son of Man, endowed with all righteousness, wisdom, and power, and it is this which is of prime importance if we are to understand the atmosphere which surrounded Christ and His disciples. To proceed with the delineation in the Book of Enoch we are told that as Son of Man He will initiate the great "day of Jehovah," and from the throne of His glory He will judge, in virtue of His Person, all beings, human and spiritual, men and angels. Existing before all time, hidden in the presence of God, dwelling with the Head of Days and the Lord of Spirits He will eventually be revealed to His elect, and His joy shall be for ever and ever, and to His dominion there shall be no limit. When He shall be revealed on the earth He will banish the wicked in Israel and all the heathen to the "flame of the pain of Sheol," the fallen angels shall He cast into a fiery furnace of Tartarus, while the kings and the mighty disappear in the depths of Gehenna.

For the righteous there will arise the dawn of a new day, a new heaven and a new earth shall be set up, where their faces will shine with a new light because of their intimate connection with the Son of Man, who in the presence of the Lord of Spirits shall reign for ever and ever.

6. *The Elijah Conception.*—This sketch of the rise and development of the Messianic ideal would not be complete without a reference to the Elijah conception. This prophecy of the coming of Elijah is confined to Malachi, the last of the canonical prophets, but that it was an important feature in connection with the Messianic hopes is clearly proved by the frequent reference to it in the Gospels. As conceived

by Malachi, Elijah must undoubtedly be classed with the expected Messiahs, but in subsequent generations he came to be viewed as a precursor of Messianic rule and not as a Messiah himself, and this is the view prevalent in New Testament times.

Summary.—When we proceed to summarise the condition of Jewish eschatological hopes as they existed at the period immediately preceding the coming of Christ we find that three great conceptions stand out clear and undisputed. First of all the expectation of the *coming of the Messianic Kingdom* was universal. There were divergences of opinion as to whether the Messianic Kingdom was to be the final consummation of God's purpose for His people, or whether it was to be a temporary prelude to the establishment of the eternal Kingdom of God in the world to come.

Equally universal was the belief in the *Judgment* and in the *Resurrection* to eternal life, although here again a great variety of views existed as to the personality of the Judge, the character of the Judgment, and the recipients of the gift of Resurrection. There was also a general impression that the approach of the Kingdom was to be accompanied by signs and portents in heaven and earth, and by an unprecedented rise of heathen power, combined with tyranny, oppression, and abomination, followed by a general apostasy and a subversion of all social and family relationships.

But when we come to sum up our impressions of the doctrine of the Messiah the result is not so simple or so clearly defined, and we are driven to conclude that the Messiah is no unitary or self-consistent personage whose attributes and functions are consistently represented throughout, and that there

15652

existed a number of variously conceived figures to which the general designation of "Messianic" may fairly be given. It is also important to differentiate between the popular Messianic conceptions of the period and the higher and more spiritual ideals nourished by an inner circle within the nation.

To the people at large the Messiah as King, of the seed of David, the Warrior Prince, who would lead the nation to ultimate victory over its enemies and restore to it its ancient glories appealed with irresistible force, and the more transcendent and spiritual conception found in other circles failed to displace it. Surviving along with it, but the possession of the comparatively few, might be found the ideal of the Messiah as the supernatural Son of Man, the elect, the righteous One, the Judge of quick and dead, the possessor of all wisdom and power, who was to inaugurate the eternal Kingdom of God. There was doubtless in some minds a synthesis of these two apparently incompatible conceptions, according to which the transcendent Messiah was also to be the Champion and Ruler of God's people.

III

The Eschatology of the Gospels

It remains for us now to enquire into the significance of these eschatological ideals and atmosphere in their relation to the life and teaching of Christ. The rise of the "eschatological school," represented principally by Johannes Weiss and Schweitzer in Germany and by Professor Burkitt in this country, has brought the question to the very forefront in connection with the interpretation of the Person and

140

teaching of Christ. It will simplify our task if we first of all formulate the theory of this strict eschatological school and then proceed to examine how far that theory is justified by His life and teaching as they are set before us in the Synoptic Gospels. The main contention of this school is that the key to the understanding of our Lord's life and teaching consists in realising that He was completely governed by the eschatological view that He was designed by the Father to bring the present world-order to an end as the essential preliminary to the establishment of the Kingdom of God in another world. He was thus the pure creation of His age, exclusively possessed by the eschatological ideas prevalent at that period, and never rose above the atmosphere in which He was born and bred.

If we accept this view the further postulate of the eschatological school, that His teaching was an "Interimsethik" adapted for abnormal and special conditions, conditions which look to a speedy end of all things, presents no difficulty. Before proceeding to demonstrate the invalidity of both these contentions it is only fitting that we should acknowledge the valuable services rendered by the exponents of these theories in the cause of historic Christianity.

(*a*) They have emphasised the supernatural and "other worldly" in Christ which the dominant Liberal school of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries had reduced to all but a vanishing point, and by insisting that the Person and teaching of Christ are to be studied in relation to the background of contemporary eschatological ideas they have given us a representation of Him from the standpoint of the first and not of the twentieth century.

(*b*) Through their action in bringing the eschatological element in the Gospels into the right perspective they have thrown a flood of light upon the Gospels, and more especially that of St. Mark, as records of His life and teaching which are essentially true to the spirit of that age. They have thus enabled us to accept at their full value the contents of these documents, considerable sections of which had been explained away or rejected as unauthentic by the prevailing criticism.

The Eschatological Element in the Gospels

The presence of the eschatological element in the Gospels is beyond all doubt, and the very earliest chapters introduce us into an atmosphere redolent of the most earnest hopes for the future. All the categories of Jewish eschatology as they have been already sketched find their place there. We have only to mention the names of Simeon, Anna, the shepherds of Bethlehem, all with their eyes fixed on the coming consolation of Israel, to realise how true this statement is.

Again, Herod the Great believed in the coming of a King of the Jews, Herod Antipas and Martha looked for a resurrection. It must be admitted, therefore, that our Lord was born into an environment in which belief in a Kingdom of God soon to be revealed, in a day of Judgment and a resurrection of the just to share in the glories of the Kingdom, was no uncommon feature. The sayings of Jesus again reveal the same feature, and we find that the eschatological element occupies in them a position in some ways comparable to the position it occupied in the outlook of the

people among whom He moved. It is probably true that some proportion of the eschatological characteristics which appear in His teaching is due to the colouring of a later age, as, *e.g.*, in the Parables of the Tares and Net in Matt. xiii. 24-40 and 47-50, where the motives of the parables have been demonstrably modified: in Matt. vii. 21 where a comparison with Luke vi. 46 shows that the non-eschatological form in the latter Gospel is probably the original; and in Mark xiii. where a "little apocalypse" would seem to have been interpolated into the genuine sayings of Jesus. But while admitting this to be the case there still remains a considerable quantity of absolutely authentic sayings of Jesus in which the eschatological element is beyond question.

Among these may be noted the following:

1. The main subject of His preaching is the Kingdom of God.

2. His undoubted claim to be the Messiah which is present even in Mark, the earliest of our Gospels. (Cf. Mark xiv. 61, 62.)

3. His promises that He will come again in power and glory. (Cf. Mark viii. 38 and x. 37, Matt. xvi. 27 and xx. 21, Luke ix. 26, as well as the parables which tell of His unexpected and sudden coming.)

It may be objected that all these citations belong to the Marcan tradition, in which some tendency to eschatological colouring may be suspected, but we find similar matter in Q and in other non-Marcan sources, as, *e.g.*:

Matthew xix. 28.	Luke xxii. 29, 30.
„ xxiii. 39.	„ xiii. 35.
„ xxiv. 44.	„ xii. 40.
„ xxiv. 27.	„ xvii. 24.

4. The description of the coming of the Son of Man who is to appear " suddenly " " with the clouds of Heaven " surrounded by " glory " and " angels " irresistibly leads us to the conviction that the coming foretold here is to be some miraculous, supernatural, but external and visible event in history. (Cf. also the emphasis upon the phrase, " this generation shall not pass away," in Mark xiii. 30, Matt. xxiv. 34, Luke xxi. 32.)

5. To these we may add other sayings which bear upon their very faces the eschatological character, such as the reference to John Baptist as Elias, the woes of the Messiah, the warnings of impending persecution and oppression and of the complete breakdown of family ties, and the nearness of the Judgment illustrated by the woes upon Capernaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida, as well as by the significant prediction before Caiaphas.

Combining all these features it must be admitted that they demand nothing less than that Christ believed in a catastrophic end of the present world-order, which would come quickly—not later than the end of His own generation—after which the Kingdom of God would be established in all its glory, in which all righteous, of the heathen as well as of Judaism, would participate.

If this were all there would be no escape from the main proposition of Schweitzer and his school, viz. that the Person and teaching of Christ are to be interpreted simply and solely in accordance with the eschatological categories of His age.

But a further study of the Gospels reveals another aspect of the Kingdom of God which complicates the problem and renders our acceptance of this strict

eschatological theory very difficult, if not indeed impossible.

We find a class of Christ's sayings in which the Kingdom of God, far from being future and heavenly, is represented as not only being actually in existence at the time, but as also being in itself an inward gift. Of the first type of teaching instances are found in Mark iii. 24, 27, in the parables of the "kingdom divided against itself" and the "strong man armed," which contain ideas which are clearly incompatible with a merely transcendent, supernatural Kingdom of God. The inwardness of the Kingdom is again taught in Luke xvii. 20, 21, where Christ declares that "The Kingdom of God is within you." The passage in Mark x. 15, "Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein," in spite of the difficulty caused by the implication that the *receiving* of the Kingdom is an essential prelude to the *entering* into it, contains undoubted teaching in the same direction. We may also refer to the Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven, where the development of the Kingdom is to be gradual in opposition to the catastrophic idea which demands that it should appear suddenly in the plenitude of its power. There is also abundant testimony to prove that Christ taught that in His earthly ministry He was actually inaugurating the Kingdom of God upon earth.

(*a*) The actual presence of the Kingdom which Christ identifies with the gift of salvation to His people is apparent in His answer to the Baptist. The Kingdom of God is realised there and then, in His own activity, in His preaching, teaching, and healing.

(*b*) Again there is little doubt that He accepted

the title of Messiah as being His natural prerogative at the time of His ministry, and that He pictured the present privileges of the disciples in a manner which pointed to the existence of the Messianic Kingdom at the time. (Cf. Luke x. 23, "Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see.")

(*c*) Furthermore, many of the signs foretold concerning the Son of Man are fulfilled now. Of these we may instance the unnatural hatred of relations toward each other, the unbelief on the part of His own family and of His own countrymen in Galilee, and the judgment which was already working itself out in separations, by election and rejection.

This evidence clearly points to the fact that in many aspects Jesus is the Messiah on earth, bringing life and salvation to those who trust in Him. He is already the Bridegroom (Mark ii. 19, 20), and the Son in a unique sense (Matt. xvii. 26). This impression is deepened when we mark the emphasis laid upon the heart of man being the true sphere of the Kingdom. It is apparent therefore that our conception of Christ and of His teaching is by no means exhausted when we express it in terms of strict eschatology, and that what von Dobschütz terms the "transmuted eschatology" of the foregoing passages must be taken into account before we can arrive at a true and complete interpretation of His Person and doctrine.

Is the Teaching of Christ an Interimsethik?

The corollary to the main contention of the eschatological school now claims our attention, viz. that the teaching of Christ was an "Interims-

ethik," and was determined solely by the belief that He was to bring to an end the present age, which was to be followed by the immediate setting up of the apocalyptic Kingdom of God.

Johannes Weiss and Schweitzer maintain that in Christ's teaching the ordinary conditions of life are no longer considered as holding good. Thus only is it possible to explain His attitude towards wealth, family, and social life; His commands to give all, not to resist evil, to forgive enemies; and His ignoring of all aesthetical and political conditions. They further declare that the main motive in obedience is that a disciple should secure a place in the Kingdom of God, and that where love, patience, and forgiveness are inculcated in the Gospels these virtues are only to be practised for the good of the soul of the disciple himself.

Prima facie this view seems to be discredited by the content of Christ's teaching, which, as we have already seen, is by no means exhausted by the eschatological element that is contained in it. Even when we have included all the eschatological material, pure as well as transmuted, it still contains only a comparatively small proportion of the Gospel tradition. Q is especially full of non-eschatological material, and the same is true in a lesser degree of Mark; and to these we must add the lengthy section which is peculiar to the third Gospel. The "Interimsethik" theory must then be pronounced to be quite inadequate, and for the following reasons:

(*a*) It does violence to the moral teaching of our Lord. To represent the Gospel virtues as mere helps to secure a safe entrance into the Kingdom of God, without any essential value in themselves and

without any influence on the world around, is entirely to misconceive the character of the doctrine of Christ. The whole question of " rewards " in the Gospels is a difficult one, but that they were not the main inducements offered to His followers is quite apparent from the Parable of the " Sheep and Goats," where the reward comes as an absolute surprise, and again from the Parables of the " Pounds " and " Talents " where the recompense is for duty done for duty's sake. We seek for the true motive of service in other directions. " Whosoever shall lose his life for My sake and the Gospel," " Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect."

The charge of selfishness as the Christian motive is immediately dispelled by the consideration of Christ's own example, whose activities are aptly described in such phrases as " He had compassion on the multitudes." Sayings like " Whoso hateth not his father and mother " are not to be explained by the eschatological expectations of the age. They spring from a deeper source and are a revelation of how the complete self-sacrifice of the Master must also have its place in the disciple's life.

(*b*) It ignores the whole group of sayings dealt with in the previous section which represents the Kingdom of Heaven as actually present on earth in His own time.

(*c*) A third point worthy of notice in this connection is that the eschatological motive and the so-called eschatological ethics are seldom found in close association in the Gospels, or, to put the objection in the words of Mr. Emmet,[1] " Where the eschatological motive, with its stress on the shortness of time, is

[1] C. W. Emmet, *Expositor*, viii. 4. p. 429.

prominent the contents of the teaching are commonplace, and in no way affected by the idea. On the other hand where the contents of the teaching might be regarded as determined by the eschatological outlook, the eschatological motive is conspicuously absent. Never do we find in the Gospels both the motive and the contents avowedly eschatological."

The teaching of the Baptist furnishes a striking illustration of this statement. The eschatological outlook of the Baptist's preaching is perfectly clear, and yet the teaching which is based upon it is confined to such moral platitudes as are contained in the phrases, "Be charitable," "Use no violence," "Be content with your wages."

In the Sermon on the Mount, on which Schweitzer relies mainly for support to his theory, although the eschatological motive is frequently apparent yet it is not found in conjunction with the startling and paradoxical precepts in which the Sermon abounds. There is no suggestion that the commands, "to turn the other cheek" or "to take no thought for the morrow," are to be obeyed because of the shortness of the time and the imminent approach of the Kingdom of God. It may be said without hesitation that the teaching of Christ, both in the Sermon and elsewhere, is essentially concerned with the conscientious performance of the duties of ordinary life, and not with special behaviour dictated by the needs of a special situation.

(*d*) Finally, the theory stultifies the whole history of the Christian Church and of Christian civilisation, both of which are based upon the permanent ethical value of the teaching of Christ. If the essence of Christianity is contained exclusively in the eschato-

logical outlook of Christ, the Christian Church has existed and progressed in virtue of qualities it never appreciated, and only in the twentieth century has it recovered possession of the forces which might have rendered it a mighty factor in the development of religion and civilisation. This is to reduce history to a farce, and is in itself, quite apart from any other consideration, sufficient to condemn the "Interimsethik" theory.

Baron von Hügel in his recent book on *Eternal Life*, has summed up the eschatological problem in words which will bear quotation. "The writer would take his stand with those who, indeed, find a genuine and full eschatological element in our Lord's life and teaching, yet who discover it there as but one of two movements—a gradual, prophetic, immanental, predominantly ethical element, and this sudden, apocalyptic, transcendental, purely religious element. Indeed the interaction, tension, between these two elements or movements is ultimately found to be an essential constituent and part of the mainspring of Christianity, of religion, and (in some sense) even of all the deepest spiritual life."

Schweitzer and his school have done valuable work in emphasising the apocalyptic element in the Gospels, but, as is the case perhaps with all new movements, the emphasis has been too one-sided and needs to be counterbalanced by other aspects of truth before their theories can be accepted as a satisfactory and adequate presentation of the doctrine and person of Jesus Christ.

Christ's Conception of His Messiahship

It now remains to be seen how, in the light of the evidence afforded by the Synoptic Gospels, Christ conceived His Messiahship, and what His true attitude was towards the various Messianic ideals prevalent in His own age.

1. *The Warrior Prince.*—It is a significant fact that the ideal of the Messiah as Warrior Prince is at the very outset absolutely rejected by Him. It is in this direction that we are to seek for an explanation of part of the drama of the Temptation. The fact that He appeared to claim recognition as the expected Messiah, and yet was in complete discordance with all that that term meant in popular Judaism, lay at the root of all the opposition that He met from the Jews all through His ministry, and finally led to His death on the Cross.

2. *The Son of Man.*—The question of the real content and meaning of the phrase " Son of Man " in the Gospels has been one of the most hotly contested points of controversy within recent years. The controversy owed its origin to Lietzmann, who in 1896 maintained that Jesus had never applied to Himself the title Son of Man, because in Aramaic the title did not exist, and on linguistic grounds could not have existed. In the language which He used the equivalent of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου was merely a periphrasis for " a man." Its use, therefore, in the Gospels in a Messianic sense was due to the influence of the Christian theology of the Apostolic age. This theory was strongly combated by Dalman in his epoch-making book on *The Words of Jesus*, in which he declares that there are no linguistic

objections to the use of the expression " Son of Man " by Jesus Himself. But while acknowledging that the phrase contains a literary reminiscence of Daniel vii. 13, Dalman did not accept the title as a synonym for " Messiah," but interpreted it as intended by Christ rather to veil His Messiahship, and to emphasise His humanity. The rise of the eschatological school has, however, changed all that, and the great majority of scholars now allow that it is essentially an eschatological conception, and that it contains a tacit reference not only to the verse in Daniel but also to the developed ideal of the pre-existing, supernatural Son of Man in the Similitudes of Enoch.

The conception is deeply rooted in the Synoptic as well as in the Johannine tradition, although it is strangely absent from the Pauline letters and from the literature of the Apostolic Church in general, which would seem to emphasise its connection with the earliest Christian tradition.

A study of the passages in the Gospels where the phrase occurs reveals a gradual development in the history of the title as a synonym for Messiahship. But this development does not imply a growing or increasing consciousness of His Messiahship on the part of Christ Himself, but is concerned with the method which He utilised to reveal that consciousness to His hearers. There seems little room for doubt that Christ from the beginning of His ministry was fully conscious of His Messianic mission, and it seems no less certain that the Synoptic Gospels manifest no trace of growth in this direction. On the other hand, the method of revelation moves step by step, from the careful and guarded suggestions of the early days of the ministry to the full and complete claim to

Messiahship under the title "Son of Man" in the trial scene before Caiaphas. We note also a marked distinction between His public preaching to the people generally and His more intimate teaching to the inner circle of disciples.

In the public preaching the use of the phrase "Son of Man" seldom gives more than a hint of its real content, and in no case does He clearly apply the phrase to Himself. This is true even of the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, where He accepts the homage of the crowd but makes no explicit statement of His Messiahship. Once and once only does He in public identify Himself with the "Son of Man" in a way which admitted of no doubt as to His meaning, and that was in His reply to the challenge of the High Priest, "Art thou the Messiah?" "I am: and ye shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven."

His course of procedure with the disciples was altogether different. In this case the disclosure of His Messiahship was gradual, progressive, and finally complete. At first, doubtless, the disciples were slow to perceive the inward meaning of the phrase, and our Lord's references to it during the early part of the ministry are more implicit than explicit in their character. They must, however, have had some perception that in such expressions as "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come," the reference was to the visions of Daniel and Enoch, and a comparison of the personalities of the "Sower" in the two parables of "The Sower" and "The Tares" must have led them far on the way towards identifying the Jesus "the Sower" of the one parable with "the Son of Man" who sends forth

His angels in the other. It was not, however, until after the notable confession of St. Peter at Caesarea Philippi that they arrived at a full conviction of the Messiahship of Christ and of His identity under the title of the " Son of Man " with the promised Messiah of apocalyptic. From this point onward there is no reserve on the part of Master or disciples. He teaches them openly and freely concerning the " Son of Man," and more particularly concerning His sufferings and death, and they are perfectly assured that this " Son of Man " is none other than Jesus Himself.[1]

3. *Judge of Quick and Dead.*—That Christ applied to Himself the apocalyptic conception of the Messiah as Judge is apparent from Mark viii. 38, " Of him shall the Son of Man also be ashamed when He cometh in the glory of His Father with the Holy Angels " ; from His warning to Caiaphas (Mark xiv. 62; cf. Matt. xxiv. 30) ; and from His promise to the Apostles, " Ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel " (Matt. xix. 28, Luke xxii. 30). The striking description of the Last Judgment which follows the Parable of the Talents (Matt. xxv. 31-46) points to the same conclusion.

4. *The Anointed Son of God.*—The Divine Sonship is clearly proclaimed at the very outset of His ministry by the voice from Heaven heard at His Baptism, and again by Himself at the very close in the trial scene before the High Priest (Luke xxii. 67, 70), where it appears as the climax of three expressions which set

[1] For a full and adequate treatment of the conception of the " Son of Man " in the Synoptic Gospels the reader is referred to Mr. Dewick's *Primitive Eschatology*, pp. 153-163, on which the foregoing paragraph is mainly based.

forth His Messiahship in the course of His examination. The expression "the Son of the living God" in Matthew's rendering of St. Peter's confession can hardly be pressed into service here, as the original form of the Apostle's words is probably given in Mark, where this phrase is not found.

5. *The Suffering Servant of the Lord.*—In our Lord's conception of His Messiahship there is a most significant feature, to which attention is drawn by Mr. Streeter,[1] viz. that His teaching is in many points in vivid contrast to that of current apocalyptic, and is more akin to that of the great prophets of the eighth century. Thus in His doctrine of the Kingdom His teaching is concentrated on essential points, such as Judgment and Eternal life, and is particularly free from fanciful pictures of tribulation and demoniac conflicts so frequently found in Jewish eschatological literature. The one solitary exception appears to be the apocalyptic picture in Mark xiii., but, as we have already pointed out, the authenticity of much of this chapter is very seriously questioned. This tendency manifests itself also in His repeated emphasis upon ethical and religious considerations. With Him, as with the prophets, "the day of the Lord" looms dimly in the future, awful, certain, but indefinite, and although the coming of the Kingdom is to Christ an essential part of His message it is not its main content. This contrast is seen at its height in the ideal of Himself as the "Suffering Servant of the Lord," who was to suffer and to die "to bear the sins of many," a conception which is never found in apocalyptic literature as a whole. I will quote Mr. Streeter's words on this point: "There dawns upon

[1] Streeter, *Foundations*, pp. 112-115, 125.

His soul the fact that before the Kingdom of God can appear a price must be paid, and the price is the life of the King. The Servant of the Lord was by His suffering and death to bring about redemption, and to Him a triumph beyond the grave, glorious and complete, is promised. That the Son of Man may return in glory He must depart in suffering and shame."

Similar testimony is borne by the Rev. R. J. Campbell, who in his essay in the *Jesus or Christ* volume thus speaks of the "suffering Servant of God": "This at least, as applied to the Messiahship, is distinctively Christian, and I hold that there is good ground for believing that it represents the special contribution made by Jesus Himself to the Christ idea. . . . The conception, borrowed as it was from the second Isaiah, had already had an honourable history before it was associated with Jesus, but, so far as we can gather, it had not become thought of as bound up with the Christ idea: probably it would have been thought utterly incompatible herewith. If to Jesus belongs the credit of having wedded the idea of Messiahship to that of the Suffering Servant, there is nothing which stamps Him greater."

Two further points remain to be considered before we bring this sketch of the eschatology of the Gospels to a close.

1. Was Christ misled in His expectations of a catastrophic end of the world order, and of the immediate establishment of the Kingdom of God? All the evidence adduced seems to prove that our Lord did expect the Kingdom to come, and to come supernaturally and in the immediate future. Was He misled in His expectations, and was He, therefore,

as Schweitzer maintains, nothing more than a deluded enthusiast, who imagined that He was to have been the agent of God in bringing about a catastrophic end of His age? If we keep merely to the letter of His teaching we may have to answer this question in the affirmative. The fact, however, that our Lord utilised the current Jewish apocalyptic as the verbal form in which to set forth His conceptions of the Last Things should not blind us to the transcendence of the spirit of His teaching when compared with that of contemporary eschatology. If the emphasis is laid on the spirit rather than on the form of Christ's eschatological teaching, there would seem to be no real difficulty in affirming that He was not wrong in His expectations. In this, as in so many other connections, there is tremendous force in Sanday's remark that our Lord enriched every Jewish idea by putting more into it than was found there.

2. The following may be suggested as some of the ways in which our Lord's predictions of the future of the Kingdom of God have been, and are being, fulfilled:

(*a*) *The Coming of the Judgment.*—To the Jew the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple with the consequent disruption of the national life and the dispersion of the nation were a Judgment, sudden, swift, and terrible. To the world at large the fall of the Roman Empire and the ruin of Graeco-Roman civilisation and culture were again a Judgment no less terrible in its results than that which overwhelmed the Jew. In another sense the Cross was a Judgment of the Messiah Himself, who was condemned to suffer for the sins of the whole world, and at the same time was a most momentous indict-

ment of all mankind. "He came unto His own and His own received Him not" (John i. 11).

(*b*) *The Coming of the Kingdom.*—(1) In one sense the promise of His speedy coming and of the immediate establishment of the Kingdom of God was fulfilled by His Resurrection from the dead, which brought into existence a new heaven and a new earth. This was the consolation which enabled St. Paul to exclaim, "O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?" It opened out to the early Christian believer a new and regenerate life, and gave him the law of perfect liberty.

(2) Again the Kingdom of God may be said to have come potentially if not actually. He Himself taught that the leaven which He brought was to leaven the whole lump. The process is slow, and even now, nineteen centuries after the Kingdom is said to have come, we are still in the presence of a civilisation which is not so much superior to that which preceded the coming of Christ. But the leaven is working still. The Kingdom was potentially set up with Christ's conquest over death. It has not yet come in all its fulness, but our salvation is nearer than when we believed.

(3) The promise of the Kingdom is also fulfilled by the constant spiritual presence of the Risen Lord with and in His faithful followers.

(4) Lastly, and most important of all, the Kingdom is realised in the Church of Christ, brought into existence at the day of Pentecost by the breath of God's Holy Spirit, sanctified and strengthened by the indwelling of the same Divine Spirit, a true Kingdom of God in which Christ Himself reigns as King and Lord of All.

CHAPTER VII

ST. PAUL AND THE MYSTERY RELIGIONS

Literature for Chapter VII.

Dieterich, *Eine Mithras-Liturgie.* 1903.
Heitmüller, *Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus.* 1903.
Reitzenstein, *Poimandres.* 1904.
Die hellenistischen Mysterien-Religionen. 1910.
Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire.* 1905.
Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity.* Four vols. 1906–11. E.T.
J. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion.* 1908.
Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States.* Five Vols. 1896–1909.
The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion. 1912.
Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra.* 1910. E.T.
Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain. 1907.
Kirsopp Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul.* 1911.
Percy Gardner, *The Religious Experiences of St. Paul.* 1911.
J. G. Frazer, "The Golden Bough." Part III., *The Dying God,* 1911.
Part IV., *Adonis, Attis, Osiris,* 1907.
Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources.* 1912. E.T.
Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters.* 1912. E.T.
Deissmann, *St. Paul.* 1912. E.T.
H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions.* 1913.
Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics,* Article on "Baptism."

In no department of knowledge has the comparative study of Religions produced more valuable results than in that which is connected with the religious condition of the Graeco-Roman world in the period immediately preceding and following the dawn of Christianity. Among the pioneers in this particular field are found the names of Cumont and Frazer, who have devoted special attention to the elucidation of the Oriental Mystery cults, Reitzenstein, with his exhaustive studies of the Hermetic literature, Wend-

land, Dieterich, Heitmüller, and Miss J. Harrison and Dr. Farnell, whose researches have thrown considerable light upon the character of Greek religion at this period. The close connection of this field of enquiry with the history of Christianity will be readily apprehended when we realise that the latter is not only a religion which is Oriental in origin and made its first approach to the world at large through the medium of the Graeco-Roman provinces of the Empire, but that it also appeared on the horizon at a time which practically coincided with that in which the Oriental Mystery cults came under the influence of the Hellenic spirit and made their appeal to the Empire as a whole. It is but natural, therefore, that many of the students of the religions which emerged from obscurity at this particular period and found a welcome in this particular part of the world should devote their efforts to discovering parallels between these various cults which then entered upon the struggle for supremacy, Christianity included. Knowing something of the methods of those who apply themselves to this particular type of study we are hardly surprised to find that the tendency among them is to discredit the distinctiveness and originality of the Christian religion, and to represent it as one among many rivals, all practically on the same historical level. As St. Paul was the principal instrument in introducing and adapting Christianity to the great Roman world, it is mainly, although not entirely, in relation to the Pauline form of the Christian religion that the comparison is instituted, with the result that it is generally maintained by these scholars that St. Paul's Christianity in many, if not most, of its essential elements is

parallel with, and dependent upon, the religious cults among which it found itself as a competitor for recognition in the world of that day. St. Paul is to the student of Comparative Religions little more than the product of his environment, and for all that is of real value in his thought and practice is indebted to Hellenistic and Oriental Mysticism, combined with the Judaistic culture of his earlier days. It is now proposed to examine this statement somewhat in detail, and to test its validity in the light of what knowledge we possess of Pauline Christianity and of the rival religions.

A brief sketch of the more important factors which contributed their share towards the formation of the religious atmosphere of the Empire at this period is a necessary preliminary to our enquiry. At the time when Christianity first dawned upon the world the ancient religions of Greece and Rome were in a state of disintegration. The old gods had become discredited in the minds of the cultured section of the community and were no longer a religious power, and philosophy, once the glory of Greece, was only a shadow of its former self. Among contemporary philosophies there was but one system which, by its loftiness of thought and expression and by its practical influence upon the lives of men, deserved to be ranked with the noblest products of the Greek mind, viz. the philosophy of the Stoics.

Stoicism.—Stoicism still provided some foundation for life, some means of linking the individual to something that could not be shaken. In Stoicism God and man, mind and matter, formed one community, and the soul of the individual partook of the very nature of God. It taught the brotherhood of man,

and gave an admirable account of duty. It preached self-denial and courage, and gave to wisdom, purity, and freedom their true value. It made a strong appeal to manhood and inspired nearly all the great characters of the early Roman Empire, and provided the impulse to almost every attempt made to maintain the freedom and dignity of the human soul. When the ancient faiths of the Graeco-Roman world were falling to pieces it contributed many of the elements best fitted to satisfy the cravings of the best minds of the time, and the characters of Epictetus, the slave, and of Seneca, the statesman, form admirable illustrations of the real greatness of Stoicism in the realms of thought and morals.

Among the Greek mysteries which still preserved a modicum of their original influence we may mention :

1. *Orphism.*[1]—This was a development of the older Dionysus-worship in which the fundamental feature had been the delirious frenzy of the Bacchanal orgies, in which the votary believed himself to be possessed by the deity. Orphism preserved this feature, but altered the conception of what the god was, and sought to partake of the godhead, not by physical intoxication, but by spiritual ecstasy, and substituted abstinence and purification for the original Dionysian drunkenness. In the Hellenistic period it came into contact with Oriental cults, by which it was considerably enriched and developed into a religious association which contained genuinely religious aspirations, intimately connected with rites of purification and of mystic initiation.

2. *The Mysteries of Eleusis.*[1]—These in the heyday

[1] For a complete description of Orphism and of "The Mysteries of Eleusis" see Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 478-571.

of Athenian prosperity were little less than a national Hellenic festival. They included an elaborate ceremonial of preparation leading to baptism and purification. They provided metaphors and phrases for Plato's description of the ideal world. The *Phaedrus*, for example, is steeped in the atmosphere of the Eleusinian rites. The framework in which the narrative is set is based upon the famous procession along the sacred way from Athens to the Temple of Demeter at Eleusis. Words like τελετή, τροφή, ἀτελής, ἐποπτεύειν, τελειός, ὁλόκληρος, all point to the Eleusinian Mysteries as Plato's source of inspiration. In their later developments, when they had probably come under the influence of the Egyptian cults, they constituted an attempt made by the Hellenic genius to construct a religion that should keep pace with the growth of thought and civilisation in Greece. They were carried from Eleusis to Rome in the time of Hadrian, and were not finally abolished until the reign of Theodosius the Great.

Oriental Mystery Cults

Most important of all, however, in connection with our subject are the Oriental Mystery Religions which flooded the Graeco-Roman world at this particular period. Their history has been preserved in some degree in ancient literature, but large additions to our knowledge of their essential character have been made by the recent discovery of inscriptions, and more especially by the magical papyri unearthed in Egypt. These consist of fragments of hymns and prayers, and of mystic names of Babylonian, Egyptian, Hellenistic, and even of Jewish

origin. The most important of these Mystery Religions are: 1. The cult of Cybele and Attis, which originated in Phrygia. 2. The cult of Serapis and Isis, which found its way into Europe from Egypt. 3. The cult of Mithra, which came from the eastern land of Persia. In the space at our disposal only the main features of the doctrines and practices connected with these cults can be emphasised.

1. *The Cult of Cybele and Attis.*—This cult, which had its centre in Phrygia but was widely diffused throughout the whole of Asia Minor, bore a remarkable resemblance to the ancient Greek cult of Dionysus. In both we find an orgiastic worship, a sacred frenzy by means of which, and during which, the worshipper was supposed to enter into union with the deity. The distinctive feature of this cult was, however, the Attis ritual, inseparably connected with the worship of Cybele. In the myth Attis, the beloved of the Great Mother, was represented as having been slain by a boar sent by Zeus, and at the famous celebration at Pessinus there was held a great orgiastic lamentation, which ended, however, with a joyful festival. The ritual of the festival thus represented the death and resurrection of the slain Attis, and the followers of the cult were initiated into mysteries in which a dying and rising again were symbolised. The "Taurobolium," or the baptism in the blood of a slain bull, the dominant feature in the later Attis ritual, was not introduced before the middle of the second century. Connected with the ritual was the "Agape," in which the partakers were handed food in the "tympanon" and drink in the "cymbalon," and were thus initiated as "mystae" of Attis and thereby became partakers in a higher life. The worship of Cybele reached

Rome as early as 204 B.C., but did not attain to any great prominence before the latter half of the first century A.D. The motive of regeneration stands in the very forefront of the ritual symbolism, and amid all its savage rites and barbaric ritual it is difficult not to see suggestions of a passionate desire for fulness of life, for a real and enduring σωτηρία.

2. *The Cult of Serapis, Isis, and Osiris.*—This was the creation of Ptolemy the Great, and, as its name implies, was essentially syncretistic. It was introduced into the Greek world in order to unite the Greek and Egyptian populations of Ptolemy's Empire by the bond of a common worship. Serapis was identified with Osiris, and to this joint cult was added that of Isis, and the combined religion went forth into the world as that of Serapis and Isis. It was widely diffused wherever the Greek language was spoken, and was essentially the religion of the less cultured and powerful classes in the Greek world, and found its adherents chiefly among slaves and freedmen. It made its way to Athens in the third century B.C. and reached Rome in the days of Sulla. Traces of it have been discovered in Britain. Much of its attraction was due to its imposing ritual, and its doctrine according to which the initiate was to share in the divine life, but it was indebted most of all to its comprehensiveness.

The effect of this was to surround Osiris with the halo of the Greek mysteries and to identify Isis sometimes with Selene, Queen of Heaven, sometimes with Demeter, and sometimes with Hera, the Queen of the gods. In the myth, represented annually, the mourning Isis seeks out the fragments of the corpse of Osiris and raises a lament over it. Then the limbs

are laid together and raised to life again by Thoth and Horus, and the Resurrection is announced to the assembled worshippers amid jubilant cries. Here, again, as in the cult of Attis, the believer is represented as sharing in the experiences of Osiris, and by means of the ceremonies of initiation in which he takes part he wins his way, along with Osiris, from death to life, and acquires the assurance of eternal being. In connection with this cult a relic of great importance has been preserved by Apuleius in his famous description of the initiation of Lucius at Cenchreae, which dates from the middle of the second century. The prominent features in the description are the abstinences, the solemn baptism, the communication of mystic formulae, and the overpowering scenes which formed the climax of initiation, all of which are closely associated with the preparation of the heart, the sense of cleansing, the conception of regeneration, and, finally, identification with the deity. The description closes with the impressive prayer of thanksgiving offered by Lucius to the goddess.

3. *The Cult of Mithra.*—Mithra was a Persian deity whose worship reached the West somewhat later than that of Isis. It struck its roots in the Empire towards the end of the Flavian period, and soon seemed not unlikely to become the religion of the whole world. It was in special favour among the legions of the Roman Army through whose instrumentality it was originally brought from its Persian home, and soldiers were the chief agents of the propaganda. It was rapidly disseminated throughout the Empire, and it was carried as far north as the Roman Wall in Britain. In its later developments were elements borrowed from Chaldaean, Persian,

and Greek cults, and to the Chaldaean influence in it we owe the name of Sunday and other days of the week, and probably even the date of Christmas day. Little is known of what was exactly taught in Mithraism, and most of the information we possess is derived from the sculptured slabs which formed the reredos in every Temple of Mithra, some of which are still in existence. The subject of the great Altar-piece is always the slaying of the Bull, which is emblematic of the profound idea of life through death.. In the few extant records that remain, Mithra is represented as the mediator between God and man, creator, regenerator, and giver of all light, the champion of justice, truth, and holiness, the comforter of man in all trouble, and more particularly the strong helper against all the powers of evil, headed by Ahriman. Mithra, the god, is always pictorially represented as a beautiful youth, clad in Persian attire, to show his perfect sympathy with the human race. The superiority of Mithra to Isis consists in the fact that there was in the cult of the former a severe and regular moral discipline, which was to issue in active warfare against all evil wrought by Ahriman. The resemblances to Christianity in Mithraism are particularly striking. It possessed a feast of Nativity, Sunday, adoration of Shepherds, Baptism, a last Supper, an ascension, and an organisation in many ways parallel to the Church. Some of these resemblances are probably due to a tendency in later times to assimilate Mithra to Christ, and some are undoubtedly due to a community of origin, such as the week of seven days which came into both systems from Chaldaea. The great popularity of Mithraism was due to a combination of causes, such as its inculcation of the brother-

hood of man which appealed to the slave and the soldier, the doctrine of atonement for the sinner, of spiritual comfort and temporal help for the afflicted, and its virtuous and strenuous example for lovers of righteousness.[1]

If Dieterich is right in assigning the Mithras Liturgy, which is preserved in the Paris MSS. and which he edited,[2] to the second century, we have evidence for the existence of a supreme act of initiation which represented a progress to the throne of Mithra. The prayers extol in lofty language rebirth from the mortal to the immortal life. Whether the liturgy is genuine or not, Mithraism was undoubtedly the best and most elevating of all the forms of heathenism known to have existed in the Empire.

Our sketch would not be complete without a brief reference to the *Hermetic Mystery literature* which has been treated with such lucidity and exhaustiveness by Reitzenstein. This literature is preserved in a Greek work called *Poimandres*, the reference being to a religious community founded in Egypt about the time of Christ, the main feature of which is the mystical basis of its doctrines, which are professed to have been derived from Hermes. This literature supplies a phase of thought which is valuable as marking a stage in the development of Greek religion from the mystery cults to Neo-Platonism. It contains Greek philosophical conceptions of the religious Stoic-Peripatetic type, relics of early Egyptian ideas, elements of magical and alchemistic doctrine so prevalent in Egypt, and liturgic fragments which probably belonged to Hellenistic Egyptian communities.

[1] For a very interesting description of Mithraism see Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, pp. 47-58.

[2] Dieterich, *Eine Mithras-Liturgie*, 1903.

Such, then, were the religions which in some cases were in occupation before Christianity appeared on the scene and in others were its contemporaries and rivals, and with all of which it had to wage a stern and severe warfare before it finally triumphed and became the official religion of the Empire. Our knowledge of them is, as we have already hinted, scanty, but certain general features emerge out of the comparative gloom. We have undoubted evidence of an elaborate ritual and of remarkable prayers, and special strains of religious thought and feeling, such as regeneration and communion with the deity, would appear to be common to all the Mystery Religions.

We also note that they were essentially religious *associations*. The conspicuous element in the religion of this Hellenistic period is the cult-brotherhood, θίασος, which replaced the old faith of the Greek City-State. The new era inaugurated by the conquests of Alexander encouraged individualism, and the pressure of religious needs transformed this individualism into cosmopolitanism, whereby men were banded together into larger or smaller groups, dedicated to the worship of a deity or a group of deities. This process would be stimulated by the wide vogue of syncretism as illustrated by the union of the Greek cult of Dionysus with the Phrygian cult of Cybele and Attis and by the combined Serapis-Isis-Osiris cult wherein are united the worships of Egypt and Greece. An absolute lack of anything like exclusiveness is one of the most significant and effective features of the Mystery Religions. Mithra, *e.g.* found room within his system for all the gods of the nations.

It is also clearly manifested that the Mystery

Religions satisfied a wide-felt need. The ultimate aim of all the cults was to raise the soul above the transiency of perishable matter to an immortal life through actual union with the Divine. In this respect they were immeasurably superior to the old national and civic religions, and represent a more advanced stage in the development of religious thought and practice. The state or city was no longer the religious unit, for the influence of the Mystery cults was intensely personal. There were two features in the propaganda which considerably enhanced its attractive power: (1) Every means was used to excite feeling. (2) It appealed to the conscience in a way never attempted by the ancient ancestral rites.

Its very symbolism was pregnant with new hopes for sin-stricken and soul-striving mortals. In its rites of purification there was represented the cleansing of the soul from all its defilements, and in its elaborate ritual of initiation the worshippers saw the assurance of a new and immortal life through union with his god.

Strongest of all its attractions was perhaps the prospect it gave the believer of overcoming the relentless tyranny of fate, and of enlisting on his side the Divine power as against the powers of the evil world which darkened and saddened his daily life. To the pagan of that age the world had fallen under the dominion of an evil power, or, more accurately, perhaps, of hosts of evil powers, all of which exercised a malignant and invincible influence upon his life. This conception assumed different aspects among different peoples. The Greeks saw the powers of evil concentrated in Fate, *εἱμαρμένη*. The Babylonians conceived them as the seven Archons who

from their dwelling in the stars decide the destinies of mortals. This idea eventually found its way into the religions of Persia and Egypt, and through them into Jewish apocalyptic literature and into the Hermetic doctrine in Greece. In the Mystery Religions there was offered deliverance from " the rulers of the darkness of this world " under whatever name and form they were conceived, and they thus provided a way of escape from the most crushing weight which then oppressed human souls, and satisfied the most intense craving in the higher life of pagan society. This deliverance was to be realised by fellowship with the higher powers who were too strong for the lower. In the present life it could be attained through mystic ecstasy ; after death it would be consummated by the ascent of the soul to heaven.

We now come to the main problem with which this chapter is concerned, which may be formulated thus :

To what extent was primitive Christianity, and more particularly Christianity as represented by St. Paul, who first brought it into touch with the Hellenistic world, influenced by the religious atmosphere and conceptions which already prevailed in that world ?

No subject connected with the history of the origin and development of Christian thought and practice has within recent years attracted more attention than this, and the labours of some of the best New Testament scholars of the day have been enlisted on its behalf.

In addition to the work of those writers, which has been already mentioned in connection with the history of the Mystery Religions as a whole, and in

which their relationship to Christianity is only a side issue, we may refer to the following books which are devoted, wholly or in part, to the elucidation of this problem: Clemen's *Primitive Christianity and its non-Jewish Sources*, Schweitzer's *Paul and his Interpreters*, Heitmüller's *Taufe und Abendmahl*, Kirsopp Lake's *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, Percy Gardner's *The Religious Experience of St. Paul*, and a series of articles by H. A. A. Kennedy on "St. Paul and the Mystery Religions" in the *Expositor*, 1912–13.[1] These articles contain a most valuable and exhaustive study of the subject, and to them I am indebted for much of the material utilised in this chapter.

The conclusions arrived at by these authorities are by no means of a harmonious character. While some of them show a tendency to ascribe most of the characteristic features in St. Paul's Christianity, and more especially his sacramental teaching, to the influence of his Hellenistic environment, others, as *e.g.* Schweitzer, the great apostle of eschatology, absolutely deny any part whatsoever to Greek thought in the development of St. Paul's thought and teaching. A few quotations in which these scholars sum up their ideas as to the extent of the influence of foreign elements upon the Apostle will serve to illustrate the complete lack of unanimity among them.

Heitmüller, speaking of St. Paul's view of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, says: "The mystical connection which in Baptism and the Lord's Supper is set up between the believer and Christ is a 'physico-hyperphysical' one, and has as its consequence that the believer shares *realiter* in the death and resurrec-

[1] Now published in a separate volume, Hodder & Stoughton, 1913.

tion of Christ. These views of the sacraments stand in unreconciled and irreconcileable opposition to the central significance of faith for Paul's Christianity, that is to say, with the purely spiritual personal view of the religious relation which stands in the foreground of St. Paul's religious life and religious thought." This can only mean that St. Paul's sacramental doctrine is entirely on a level with, and is practically based on, that prevalent in the Mystery Religions.

Kirsopp Lake: "Christianity always at least in Europe is a Mystery Religion."[1] Baptism for St. Paul and his readers was universally and unquestionably accepted as a mystery, a sacrament which works *ex opere operato*."[1]

Percy Gardner:[2] "The whole character of Christianity as viewed by Paul bears great and undeniable likeness to the pagan Mysteries." "The Christianity of Paul resembles the Greek mysteries in three essential features: (1) It had rites of purification, etc. (2) It had means of communication with the Deity looked up to as the head. (3) It extended beyond the present life into the world beyond the grave."

We may also quote the opinions of two scholars who attribute to St. Paul the most complete Hellenisation of Christianity.

Loisy:[3] "Paul's conception of Christ was a Saviour-God after the manner of an Osiris, Attis, or a Mithra. Like them he belonged by His origin to the celestial world; like them He made His appearance on the earth; like them He had accomplished a work of universal redemption, efficacious and typical:

[1] K. Lake, *op. cit.* pp. 215, 385. [2] Gardner, *op. cit.* pp. 80, 81.
[3] Loisy, *Hibbert Journal*, 1911, p. 51.

like Adonis, Osiris, and Attis he had died a violent death and had been restored to life."

F. C. Conybeare : [1] " The sacred meal which Paul describes was the counterpart of the Jewish sacrifices to Jehovah and of Gentile sacrifices to their devilish gods. Communion was effected between the worshippers and the god by the old-world sacrificial rites, and so Christians by bread and wine attained communion with Christ. . . . In some of his conceptions Paul drops from the heights of idealism into the depths of primitive magic and fetichism."

A somewhat modified form of the same theory is enunciated by Pfleiderer : " Paul's teaching on Baptism and the Lord's Supper bears a close resemblance to that found in Mithraism which was found at Tarsus as early as the time of Pompey. His mystical teaching is based on a combination of Christian ideas with the ideas and rites of the same cult which he learnt in his own city. The longing for salvation, purification, guarantee of life revealed by these mysteries appealed to him, strict Jew though he was. Jewish influences were, however, more important than heathen in Pauline theology." [2]

At the other end of the scale we have Schweitzer who denies *in toto* the influence of the mysteries on Pauline thought. He regards the teaching of St. Paul as eschatological through and through. All its peculiar features, its contradictions, and its problems are to be explained by the special circumstances of the period in which he found himself, the brief interval between the Death and Resurrection of Christ and His Parousia. In St. Paul sacraments are of the

[1] Conybeare, *Myth, Magic, and Morals.*
[2] See *Origins of Christianity*, pp. 156-183.

nature of "sealings" which guarantee the ultimate salvation of the participant at the Parousia.[1]

Clemen allows that the Apostle is dependent upon Stoicism in the matter of his speech at Athens, and in some minor features of his teaching as given in the Epistles. With regard to the Pauline teaching concerning the two great Christian ordinances, he maintains that it is only the *terminology* that is to be traced to pagan sources, and that the doctrines themselves are quite independent of these influences.[2]

Dr. Kennedy holds a position somewhat midway between these two extremes. He holds that St. Paul must have been familiar from the outside with religious ideas current in these influential cults. He certainly used technical terms like τέλειος, πνευματικός, σωτηρία, which were in the air, but meant one thing for the Christian and quite another for the pagan. The same is true of groups of ideas which suggest a background for the Apostle's conceptions akin to the Mystery Religion doctrines. The central conceptions of the Mystery Religions belong, however, to a different atmosphere from that in which the Apostle habitually moves, and there is nothing in them corresponding to the place which the Cross of Christ holds in the realm of St. Paul's thought and experience.

A glance at the foregoing quotations and opinions demonstrates that Mystery Religion influences are postulated mainly in regard to three particular features in St. Paul's doctrine and practice.

(*a*) *His mysticism*, as revealed in such phrases as "crucified with Christ," "baptized into His death," "risen with Christ," "putting on Christ," "in

[1] Schweitzer, *op. cit.* pp. 230-241.
[2] Clemen, *op. cit.* pp. 367-370.

Christ," "Christ in me," and also in the references to visions, ecstatic experiences, and "spiritual gifts."

(*b*) *His use of Mystery Religion technical terms* such as those quoted above and σοφία, γνῶσις, εἰκών, δόξα, ἀποκάλυψις; the triplicate division of human personality into νοῦς, ψυχή, σάρξ; and the antithesis between πνευματικός and ψυχικός.

(*c*) *His conception of salvation*, regeneration, the Death and Resurrection of the Redeemer-God, and more particularly the doctrines alleged to be associated with the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, whereby communion with Christ is attained through partaking of Him.

There are *objections* of a general character which tell strongly against the extreme theory of ascribing any really effective influence of the Mystery Religions upon Pauline Christianity.

1. *The Question of Chronology.*—With the exception of the Serapis cult the Mystery Religions were not widely diffused in the Empire until the middle of the second century, and it was not until after this that they became transformed from local cults into universal Mystery Religions. St. Paul, therefore, could not have known them in their developed condition, and could have only been familiar with them in their somewhat simple form before they were filled with the Greek yearning for redemption and began to exercise a mutual influence upon one another. In this case it is quite as justifiable to conceive a Christian influence upon the Mystery Religions as it is to demand the opposite. Schweitzer strongly emphasises this objection, but its force is rather diminished by Kennedy's criticism, who points out

that the very elaborate form of the Mystery Religions in the second and third century demands a lengthy period of development and that their roots and stem must have been in existence as early as the Pauline period.

2. *The Absence of anything like adequate Knowledge of the Mystery Religions.* — There is undoubtedly a tendency among the students of these cults to erect a building out of material that is wholly inadequate for the purpose and to counterbalance their lack of genuine matter by inserting their own hypotheses. Their conceptions of the Mystery Religions, upon which they base their theories as to their relationship to Pauline Christianity, owe considerably more to what they consider these religions ought to have been than to any definite knowledge of them that is really available. Thus they have manipulated out of the various fragments of information that we possess a kind of universal Mystery Religion which as a matter of fact never existed.

3. It is difficult to understand how St. Paul, if he had introduced such a tremendous innovation as to Hellenise Christianity on the scale he is asserted to have done, could have been allowed by the representatives of primitive Christianity to have remained as one of themselves and an honoured member of their community.

4. Finally, if this theory is true, how could later Greek theology pass over in silence the one man who had been its precursor in uniting the conceptions of Graeco-Oriental religion with the original Gospel. The fact that Paulinism played no part in the subsequent development of Christian doctrine in the East during the next two centuries, but was left

unused and uncomprehended, is inexplicable on this theory.[1]

We will now proceed to deal with some of the assumptions of this school in detail.

1. *St. Paul's Mysticism.*—It would appear to be by no means necessary to trace the mysticism which was an unquestionable feature of the Apostle's character to the influence of the Mystery cults. A more natural origin is found in Judaism itself, in which mysticism and the phenomena usually associated with it had played no small part for centuries. Religious excitement, frenzy, and music are found closely connected with the prophetic function as far back as the days of Samuel, and are in every case attributed to the influence of the "Spirit of the Lord." We also find strong affinities between the prophetic idea of the "knowledge of God" and St. Paul's conception of γνῶσις, and the prophets claim to be in direct touch with Jehovah himself. Cf. Amos iii. 8, "The Lord hath spoken, who can but prophesy?" Again visions and ecstatic conditions are all-important features in the prophetic work of Ezekiel.

These "mystical" elements are still more prominent in the Jewish apocalyptic literature which provides abundant evidence that the writers had a wide knowledge of ecstatic conditions which are again and again ascribed to the spirit. The visions and revelations of Jewish apocalyptic are in many instances connected with the ascent of the soul to heaven, and supply close parallels to St. Paul's ecstatic experiences described in 2 Cor. xii. That there were foreign elements in St. Paul's mysticism is probably true, but

[1] These objections are set forth with much fulness in Schweitzer, *op. cit.* pp. 192 ff. and 229 f.

they had been derived indirectly through the medium of Judaism. Such conceptions as the ascent of the soul to the higher world formed an important element in Greek religion as far back as the days of Plato, and had a place also in Egyptian and Persian culture.

Again the many parallels which exist between 4 Ezra and St. Paul suggest that they both belonged to the same circle of Judaism. In some things the Apostle was also indebted to the " Wisdom " literature where we find the " wise " man regarded as possessing a special " Divine " endowment (Wisdom of Solomon ix. 7). To a similar source we may assign some of the Pauline cosmogonies which had come into Judaism as the result of contact with Babylonian-Persian ideas for at least five hundred years. It is in this direction that we also ought to look for St. Paul's conception of the worship of the elements (*στοιχεῖα*) Gal. iv. 3, 9, and Col. ii. 8, 20, and of his angelology and demonology which had crept into Judaism as the result of Babylonian and Persian thought. It seems, therefore, unnecessary to attribute St. Paul's mysticism and its cognate phenomena to the influence of the Mystery Religions. Its more prominent elements were already present in Judaism, and it is to his environment as a Jew, and not as a Hellenist, that the Apostle was indebted for this feature in his character.

2. *Pauline Terminology.*—In this connection it is well to begin by acknowledging that he frequently employs terms which had a technical meaning in the Mystery Religions, and more especially in his letters to Corinth and in those of the imprisonment. These Epistles are all addressed to communities which must have had intimate contact with Mystery-brotherhoods, and among his converts in these Churches there must

have been many who had been themselves members of such brotherhoods. The Apostle's usage is not confined to single terms for we find far-reaching conceptions to which there are striking analogies in pagan religions. This does not necessarily imply that he was acquainted with Hellenistic religious literature as Reitzenstein assumes. Many of the liturgical formulae and technical terms would be in popular use and must have been well known to members of the Christian communities in large cities like Corinth, and were probably equally familiar to St. Paul. In 1 Cor. ii. 6 ff., *e.g.* we have groups of conceptions which have close associations with the Mystery Religions, and in 1 Cor. ii. 1-10, where the Apostle speaks of a more advanced stage of knowledge, Christian instruction which demands a higher grade of understanding, there is certainly a suggestion of the "Mysteries." The use of such terms as *πνευματικός*, *τέλειος*, *σοφία* seems to demand a similar background.

Reitzenstein in his well-known researches into the Hermetic literature and its parallels in the magical papyri and contemporary pagan Mystery cults asserts that St. Paul's various uses of *πνεῦμα* are all found in Hellenistic religious documents: that the antithesis between *πνευματικός* and *ψυχικός* was current before St. Paul's time: that *νοῦς* had already become an important religious term, the direct equivalent of *πνεῦμα*, and that in consequence all the passages where the words occur in the Epistles can be explained from Hellenistic usage. On the other hand, the Pauline use of *πνεῦμα*, *νοῦς*, *σάρξ*, *ψυχή* and the antithesis already referred to can be quite easily explained from Old Testament usage, and every

leading conception in the sphere of St. Paul's religious thought may be said to have its roots definitely laid in the soil of the Old Testament.[1]

3. *St. Paul's Conception of Salvation and of the Sacraments.*—It is, however, in connection with the Apostle's conception of salvation, and its relationship to, and dependence upon, the ordinances of Baptism and the Eucharist, that the exponents of the Hellenising theory are most insistent as to the influence of the Mystery Religions. In the Mystery Religions, as well as in Christianity, salvation is the central feature. The chief aim of the Mystery Religions was to offer salvation to those who had been duly initiated, and salvation meant deliverance from an omnipotent fate, and more especially from death. This salvation with its assurance of a life which death cannot quench was attained by the process of "rebirth," and was sometimes an actual deification whereby a genuinely Divine life was imparted to the votary. In every case it depended upon some kind of contact with the deity. This contact with the god, through which the process of regeneration or deification became possible, is effected in various ways in the different cults.

(*a*) Communion with the god can be gained through partaking of him. This is a very ancient conception prevalent in early Egyptian religions, and was also associated with the rites which circled round the mystic figure of Dionysus-Zagreus, in which the bull, representing the deity, is torn asunder and devoured, and by this means the life of the god passes into the worshipper.

(*b*) Another form of procedure was by means of

[1] For a proof of this statement the reader is referred to Kennedy's articles in the *Expositor*, viii. iv. pp. 226-237.

the Greek religious ἐνθουσιασμός. This is described in a prayer to Hermes, "Come to me, O Lord Hermes, even as children enter into the mother's womb," where the idea is that of the god entering into the human personality as it was. Often, however, this was only another name for ἔκστασις, when the soul was regarded as leaving the body and becoming one with deity. In the cult of Dionysus and in the Phrygian worship of Cybele this took the form of a delirious frenzy in which the votary was assumed to enter into the most intimate communion with the god, and, in some cases, to become the dwelling-place of the deity himself.

(*c*) In the cults of Osiris and Attis there were represented the Death and Restoration to life of a Divine personage by entering into sympathy with whom the initiate obtained the guarantee of undying life for himself. In the former cult the worshipper, as having become one with the god raised to life again, shared eternally in that Divine life. The description of Lucius' initiation into the Isis mysteries, already alluded to, supplies some remarkable hints of a death issuing in life through which the initiated have to pass. Here the initiatory rites are definitely described as a "voluntary death" followed by a new life.

What then is the relationship of these Graeco-Oriental conceptions to St. Paul's central doctrines of redemption and salvation?

1. *The Relation between Christ and the "Redeemer-God" of the Mystery Religions.*—It is freely asserted by Loisy and others that the Pauline Christ is a Saviour-God, and as such is definitely parallel to the gods of these cults. He, like them, died a violent

death and was restored to life again. This assertion would seem to be open to two objections.

(*a*) A " Redeemer-God " who for the sake of man and for his salvation came into the world and died and rose again cannot be found in any Oriental myth or in any Mystery Religion. The " Redeemer-God," who is postulated by Loisy and those who think with him is simply the result of a process of synthesis of the various Mystery cults, and as a completely defined personage is non-existent in any one single cult taken by itself.

(*b*) To St. Paul, Jesus, the Redeemer and Saviour, is a strictly historical Person whom he had actually seen himself, and of whose life and work he had considerable knowledge. Osiris and Attis were never more than mythological personifications, and the legends of their deaths have no essential connection with a purpose of redemption. There is no real comparison between the story of the murder of Osiris, or the self-destruction of Attis, and the restoration to life of these mythical Divine personages and the self-sacrificing Death and Resurrection of Jesus.

2. *The Pauline Doctrine of Salvation compared with the " Mystery " Doctrine of Regeneration (involving Salvation or Deification) through Communion with the Deity.* — Σωτηρία in the Mystery Religions has primarily in view the pressure of burdens which are involved in the limitations of earthly life, and more especially the crushing and universal burden of death. Even in the Osiris cult, where the language used concerning immortal life is lofty, that life is conceived as a precise form of bodily life like the restored life of Osiris himself. In many of the cults, as *e.g.* that of Cybele, it is extremely difficult to determine what

the eternal future meant. It is also beyond question that their conception of the process of salvation was very little removed from the magical. It was attainable by the exact performance of certain ceremonies, and, once attained, could never be lost. But that which separated the Mystery Religion salvation most definitely from redemption as conceived by the Apostle was that there was connected with the former no essential demand for a new moral ideal. To compare this with St. Paul's conception of salvation unto eternal life is to establish a relation between two sets of ideas that are in no way comparable. Salvation in St. Paul involves immortal life in the profoundest sense of the phrase, a sharing in the Divine life, which means for him primarily love and holiness. The ethical factor is never absent, and salvation apart from the highest moral ideal is unthinkable to the Apostle. The very atmosphere of salvation, again, is the love of God revealed to men in the Cross of Christ. Everything in St. Paul looks back to the Cross, and it is this above all else that reveals the impassable gulf between Pauline salvation and that of the Mystery Religions. I would quote in this connection some very relevant words of the late Dr. Bigg. Speaking of the essential difference of Christianity from all other religions he says: "Christianity *per genus* is a religion, *per differentiam* it is the religion of the Cross. The Fatherhood of God, the immortality of the soul, revelation, sacrifice, prophecy, and law are common to many religions. The belief that by virtue men became like God, children of God, and attain to communion with God, their Divine Father, is a commonplace of Greek idealism and is found in many of the better pagan cults. The idea of a

Messiah is common to Judaism and Christianity, and something very like it meets us in the 'inspired men' of Platonism and the 'heroes' of Hellenism. But the Cross is the peculiar property of the Gospel. This is the emblem the first Christians adopted. From this peculiar feature of the Christian faith flow all the distinctive beliefs and practices of the Church which, though all or almost all are common in some degree to other religions, have received a specially Christian form and development from this central doctrine." [1]

It is true that salvation according to St. Paul is intimately associated with communion with the Divine. Cf. "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature," 2 Cor. v. 17; but the new creature here is in the closest relationship to the sacrifice of the Cross of Christ, and cannot be separated from the demonstration of the Divine love in the Crucified.

Again there is nothing in the Mystery Religions corresponding to the characteristic Pauline doctrine of "faith." The significant Pauline phrase, "In Christ," implies an unspeakably intimate relation of the believer to Christ, brought about by the personal surrender of the believer's life to the Master in humble and adoring faith. Now this central Pauline conception of salvation has no real equivalent in the Mystery Religions. Even if we allow that the initiates into the mystic cults regarded themselves as having died with the Divine personage whose restoration to life they celebrated, it is something on an entirely different plane from the death unto sin and a new life unto holiness of which St. Paul speaks. There may be a certain relationship in imagery, but the true content of the two conceptions are as wide apart as the poles.

[1] Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, Introduction, p. xi.

3. *The Pauline Sacraments and their Relationship to the Mystery Religions.*—Closely connected with the subject of "salvation" is that of the Sacraments, both in the Christian religion and in the Mystery cults. Now it has been the chief aim of recent research to discover the relationship between these two sets of sacramental ideas. The quest was apparently a simple one because in both cases lustrations and sacred meals played a prominent part and had a sacramental value, but on closer examination it was found very difficult to get beyond the fact that there were between the two systems resemblances of a very general nature.

We will consider the two great Christian ordinances separately.

(1) *Baptism.*—Lustrations and rites of purification were common to all the Mystery cults, as *e.g.* the bath of cleansing in the sea in the Eleusinian Mysteries (ἄλαδε μύσται), and the ablutions in the ritual of Isis as described by Apuleius. Tertullian also tells us that the idea of regeneration was associated with these washings (*De Bapt.* v.). Our knowledge, however, of the details of the baptismal rites in these cults is exceedingly meagre and inadequate. There are two points with regard to them which are tolerably clear, and which distinctly separate them from the Christian Sacraments: (*a*) There is no trace of Baptism into the name of the deity. The confession of the god may be implied in the rite, but there is not, as in Christian Baptism, a definite and special confession of faith in the deity. (*b*) There is no hint that the Divine spirit was connected with the ritual of lustrations.

Writers who assert a very intimate relationship

between the Pauline Sacraments and those of the Mystery Religions profess to find a strong proof of this in the fact that St. Paul links Baptism to the experience of Death and Resurrection with Christ, and refer this connection to the suggestions of a dying to live which they find in the Mystery cults. Thus K. Lake[1] holds that the average Gentile God-fearer, regarding Pauline Christianity as a Mystery Religion, looked upon Baptism as an *opus operatum* which secured admission into the Kingdom of God quite apart from the character of his future conduct, and is prepared to credit the Apostle himself with a similar magical conception. Furthermore, they contend that the conception of mystical union with Christ is in St. Paul essentially and exclusively related to Baptism, and they quote such phrases as " Baptized into the death of Christ," " Buried with Him through baptism into death," " Buried with Him in baptism " (Rom. vi. 3, 4), " For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ " (Gal. iii. 27) in support of their contention.

Heitmüller also ascribes a quasi-magical power to the use of the " Name " in Baptism, and maintains that herein it is parallel with the use of the Name in other connections, as *e.g.* in exorcism. His view is that the solemn pronouncement of the Name of Jesus at Baptism is not a merely symbolic form, but is thought of as associated with real mystical mysterious effects, and implies a being actually taken possession of by the power which is designated by the " Name " Jesus, the expulsion of all hostile powers, consecration, and inspiration.

A final argument in the same direction is based

[1] Lake, *op. cit.* pp. 46, 385.

on the supposed Pauline practice of "Baptism for the dead." Wernle, among others, regards it as self-evident that St. Paul in permitting and approving of "Baptism for the dead" had allowed himself to become infected by the heathen superstition of his Corinthian converts.

The lack of harmony in the matter of the conclusions drawn by the protagonists in this discussion as to the relation of the Pauline Sacraments to those of the Mystery Religions is only equalled by the divergences between their conceptions of the real character of the Apostle's sacramental teaching.

Kirsopp Lake, although we may differ from him as to some of his ultimate conclusions, has undoubtedly done valuable service in pointing out that Catholic Christianity in its Sacramental teaching is the normal and organic development of primitive Christianity, and not a degenerate form of it, as so many modern critics allege. There is in his conception of the Pauline Sacraments, however, a tendency to take a too one-sided view of them as the following quotation shows: "The Pauline doctrine of Baptism is that on the positive side it gives the Christian union with Christ which may also be described as inspiration with the Holy Spirit, while on the negative side it cleanses from sin. This is accomplished by the power of the Lord Jesus Christ by the sacramental effect of water, *according to the well-known idea that results could be reached in the unseen spiritual world by the performance of analogous acts in the visible world*"[1] (the italics are not in the original). Here Lake unquestionably ignores the real function of faith on

[1] Lake, *op. cit.*; *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ii. p. 382.

the part of the person baptized as demanded by the Apostle.

KENNEDY, on the other hand, argues strongly against any real relation between Pauline Baptism and that of the Mystery Religions, and attempts to prove his point by watering down the sacramental element in St. Paul's teaching. His standpoint is illustrated by the following citation: "Faith has already (*i.e.* before Baptism) brought the believer into the sphere of those high privileges which he enjoys, the experience of the Divine grace, hope, the love of God, the gift of the Holy Spirit. It has already involved a break with sin. In Baptism something happened. Faith had been there before, the Divine Spirit was already present, taking of the things of Christ and showing them to the believer. But now, once for all, the convert makes his own the promptings of the Divine love in his heart, and then there would come to him in his Baptism a wonderful spiritual quickening, a new enhancing of the power and grasp of faith, a fresh realisation of communion with the once crucified and now risen Lord."[1] He denies, however, that the pronunciation of the "Name" could enable the user to enjoy the benefits of the attributes attached to the owner of the "Name," and asserts that there is no indication whatsoever of "the sacramental effect of water."

SCHWEITZER'S views on Sacraments generally are exceedingly vague and difficult to comprehend. Of one thing only is he positive, that St. Paul's sacramental conceptions can in no way be traced to Hellenistic or Mystery Religion influences. He also propounds the theory that the idea of "regeneration"

[1] See *Expositor*, 1912, pp. 548, 550.

generally associated with Baptism is not found in St. Paul at all, but is definitely Johannine.[1]

To return once again to the contentions of the thorough-going Hellenists, it would seem that the attempt to find any essential relationship between Christian Baptism and that of the Mystery Religions is by no means an easy task, and that it is confronted with the following difficulties:

(*a*) There is no trace of the use of the "name" of the god in connection with Mystery cult baptism, and no hint of the gift of the Spirit, which is an essential element in Christian Baptism.

(*b*) Again it is not correct to say that in St. Paul mystical union with the Death and Resurrection is exclusively related to Baptism. The large majority of the Apostle's utterances concerning death with Christ have no reference whatsoever to Baptism. While giving to St. Paul's conception its full sacramental significance, it is quite clear from these utterances that when he speaks of "dying with Christ" he is moving in quite another circle of ideas. Cf. Phil. iii. 10, where there is no suggestion of Baptism in the context.

(*c*) The significance of "faith" in St. Paul is an element that is entirely absent from the Mystery Religion conception of Baptism. The new life, which means for the Apostle a right relation to God, and which is the believer's inheritance in Baptism, is reached along the pathway of faith in Christ crucified and raised from the dead. In St. Paul's doctrine Faith and Baptism are indissolubly connected, and Faith without Baptism and Baptism without Faith are both equally unthinkable for him.

[1] Schweitzer, *op. cit.* pp. 216-218.

(*d*) With regard to the question of "Baptism for the dead," Schweitzer[1] roundly asserts that there is no trace of anything of the kind in pagan religions, and that the one instance generally quoted from Plato's *Republic* (ii. 364-365) does not refer to baptism at all, but to expiatory sacrifices in the ancient Greek sense. The magical papyri speak of baptism *of* the dead, and nowhere of baptism *for* the dead. But even if we grant that the practice may have existed in certain pagan communities, and may have crept therefrom into the Church at Corinth, the fact that St. Paul refers to it in his letter implies neither belief in it nor approval of it.

(2) *The Lord's Supper: Sacramental Meals in the Mystery Religions.*—The evidence regarding sacramental meals also in the Mystery Religions is very meagre and difficult to interpret. There are two definite references to such meals in some fragments preserved by Clement of Alexandria.[2] (*a*) "I fasted, I drank the *κυκεών*," an Eleusinian fragment which may refer to a sacramental drinking of the same cup as the goddess in her sorrow. (*b*) A formula also found in Clement[2] and handed down in another form by Firmicus Maternus, to which allusion has already been made.[3] "I have eaten out of the *τύμπανον*, I have drunk out of the *κύμβαλον*, I have become an initiate of Attis." Dieterich[4] admits that our knowledge of the facts in connection with sacramental rites in the Dionysiac ritual is quite inadequate.

The most common accusation brought against the Pauline conception of the Eucharist is that it is based upon the heathen idea that communion with the

[1] Schweitzer, *op. cit.* pp. 211-212.
[2] Clem. Alex. i. pp. 16, 18: 13, 10. [3] See p. 125.
[4] Dieterich, *Eine Mithras-Liturgie*, ii. p. 105.

deity is attainable by "eating the god." In some primitive "nature worships" the idea no doubt existed that the worshipper could unite himself to the god by eating of him, or, in a secondary stage, by consuming some substance which had been marked out for the purpose as representing the deity and had the deity's name attached to it. This is found in the early religion of Egypt; in the Thracian orgiastic worship of Dionysus Zagreus where, as we have already pointed out,[1] the sacred bull was torn in pieces while yet alive and devoured raw; and also among the Aztecs in South America, who, before sacrificing and eating their prisoners of war, gave them the name of the deity to whom the sacrifice was offered.

Heitmüller,[2] after speaking of these rites among the Egyptians, Thracians, and Aztecs, goes on to say: "Little as the *δεῖπνον κυριακόν* might seem to have in common with these . . . proceedings, loth as we are at first even to name the Lord's Supper in the same breath with them, as little is it to me a matter of doubt that when looked at from the point of view of Comparative Religions the Lord's Supper of primitive Christianity has the closest connection with them. These pictures supply the background from which the Lord's Supper stands out; they show us the world of ideas to which it belongs in its most primitive and therefore perspicuous form." The effect of this is, however, somewhat minimised by his further statement that, in view of the fragmentary condition of our sources, it would be precarious to prove a direct dependence on definite phenomena, on the cultus feast of the Mithra Mystery for instance,

[1] See p. 142.

[2] Heitmüller, *Taufe und Abendmahl*, p. 56 f.

and that it is safer to point to the general characteristics of the time, which abounded with ideas of that kind, and when infant Christianity lived in an atmosphere which was impregnated with mystery *bacilli*.

Schweitzer [1] and Kennedy,[2] however, both emphasise the fact that the parallels brought forward to illustrate the idea of communion with the god by partaking of him are not derived from the Mystery Religions at all, but have been collected from the most primitive phases of religion. There is no evidence that this conception of union with the god survived to the time of the Mystery Religions, and research has hitherto failed to discover any reference to the " eating of the god " in any one of them. All that we can say with any certainty of the Mystery Religion sacrificial feasts is that they were supposed to convey supernatural power.

Another objection to the foregoing contention comes from the Pauline side. The conception of the " eating of the god " has no place in St. Paul's thought. He knows nothing of the eating and drinking of the Body and Blood of Christ. He only speaks of the eating and drinking of the Bread and the Cup.

A further dependence of St. Paul's sacramental conceptions is based upon the following passages, all taken from 1 Corinthians:

(*a*) *Chap.* x. 1-5, where the Apostle emphasises the fact that the enjoyment of high privileges such as Baptism and the Eucharist does not necessarily ensure acceptance with God, and confirms his statement by reference to Israel in the wilderness.

(*b*) *Chap.* x. 14-22, where the close connection

[1] Schweitzer, *op. cit.* pp. 195-197.
[2] Kennedy, *Expositor*, viii. v. p. 63.

of the Pauline Sacraments with the sacrificial meals of paganism is held to imply the essential relation of the one to the other.

(*c*) *Chap.* xi. 27-30, where the evil effects of eating and drinking unworthily are compared by Heitmüller to a belief of the Syrians that the eating of sardines, which were sacred to Atargatis, produced ulcers and wasting disease.[1]

With reference to the first of these passages, Lake says, speaking of this tenth chapter: "It is explicable only if we see that it is a warning against the view that Christians are safe because they have been initiated into the Christian Mysteries. It is the proof of the existence of a 'spiritual party' (*πνευματικοί*) who by initiation into the Christian Mysteries was raised above carnal considerations."[2]

It is quite impossible within the limits of a chapter of this length to do anything like justice to the Pauline conception of the Eucharist, and one must be content to emphasise a few salient features in his sacramental teaching which would seem to disprove conclusively the more extreme conclusions implied in the preceding statements.

1. There are two elements in communion as understood by St. Paul which are wholly wanting in the pagan sacramental or sacrificial meals; (*a*) The apocalyptic element implied in the words, "Till He come" (2 Cor. xi. 26), and (*b*) the spiritual reality of the communion with Christ as contrasted with the mere formal or ritual rites of communion with the ancestor or hero in the heathen festivals.[3]

2. With reference to the "eating unworthily" in

[1] Heitmüller, *op. cit.* pp. 50, 51. [2] Lake, *op. cit.* p. 177.
[3] P. Gardner, *op. cit.* p. 122.

1 Cor. xi. 27-29, the Syrian parallel is not valid here, because the evil effects in the former are not traced to the eating of the elements. The offence is sacrilege against the crucified Christ (cf. Hebrews vi. 6, "Crucifying for themselves afresh the Son of God and putting Him to open shame"), which brings with it a κρῖμα, a judgment sent by God for the ultimate discipline of those who have been guilty.[1]

3. There is very little, if any, real essential difference between St. Paul's official description of the Eucharist and that found in the Synoptic Gospels, and there has been as yet no attempt to postulate Hellenistic influences in the case of the latter. The only significant addition in the Pauline account is the injunction to repeat the celebration as a memorial. The main features in the record in 1 Corinthians are also found in the Synoptists. With reference to the Cup, Mark, Matthew, and Luke (except the western text) contain the words: "This is my blood of the covenant [Luke, "the new covenant in my blood"] shed for many" (Luke, "for you"). The words which accompany the giving of the Cup also make clear the meaning of those which were spoken at the distribution of the Bread even in the brief form found in Matthew and Mark, "This is my body." The version in St. Luke and St. Paul, "This is my body which is for you" (Luke, "which is given for you") is only an extension which is true to the thought of Jesus explicitly defined in the words of the giving of the Cup. There is therefore in the Eucharist, as instituted by Christ or as developed by St. Paul, no evidence of anything magical or realistic.

4. Here again, as in the case of Baptism, the

[1] Kennedy, *Expositor*, viii. v. p. 74.

absence of anything approximating to that faith, which is the indispensable postulate of all that is of spiritual worth in the Pauline Eucharist, separates the sacramental meals of the Mystery Religions from the Christian ordinance by an impassable gulf.

Summary.—The true relation of St. Paul to the Mystery Religions lies somewhere between the two extremes advocated by the different parties in this discussion. St. Paul is not the mere Jew of Schweitzer, and his thought is not to be explained entirely and exclusively on the lines of Jewish eschatology. On the other hand we cannot allow that his central conceptions, his doctrine of redemption, and his teaching concerning the Christian Sacraments, or the mysticism which is such an important element in his character, are the mere outcome of his contact with Hellenistic and Oriental Mystery Religions. To ascribe the mind and thought of St. Paul to any one single source is entirely to misconceive the man, who was too full and many-sided to be capable of so simple an explanation.

That the strongest influence in him was that of the Old Testament seems hardly open to question; but even here should be borne in mind the fact that Deissmann[1] has so rightly emphasised that his Bible was that of the Greek and not of the Hebrew world, and that the LXX must have exercised a strong Hellenistic influence upon him from the very commencement of his conscious life. The effects of Jewish apocalyptic and eschatological literature are also apparent in his writings, but not in the exclusive sense demanded by Schweitzer. The cosmopolitan aspect of St. Paul's character must be carefully

[1] Deissmann, *St. Paul*, p. 101 f.

weighed in any discussion of this type. He was born and bred in Tarsus, a great University city, the home of Stoicism, and at one time a centre of the cult of Mithra. In all the main centres of his missionary operations he must have been brought into constant touch with the forces of the Mystery Religions. His Epistles supply clear evidence that he was not above deriving some of his most striking parallels and metaphors from the public life of the Greek provinces of the Empire, from the athletic festivals and the civic institutions. In his great central doctrines of redemption, justification, forgiveness, reconciliation, and adoption his metaphors are all taken from the practice of Graeco-Roman law.[1] This leads us to infer that he would be equally sensitive to the religious environment in which he found himself. That he was indebted to the Mystery Religions for his main conceptions, or that he transformed Christianity so as to bring it into line with the Graeco-Oriental Mystery cults, is certainly not proved. An influence of some kind does, however, seem to be required by the evidence, as the following particulars will show:

1. *The Influence of Greek Philosophy.*—He was influenced by Greek philosophy, not merely in his figures of speech but also in much of the substance of his teaching. This is specially true of Stoicism with which his thought had much in common, and it is only what we might have looked for in a native of Tarsus, a city closely associated with much that is best and noblest in the Stoic School.

2. *The Use of Mystery Religion Terminology.*—That he occasionally made use of a technical vocabu-

[1] Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 154.

lary derived from the language of the Mysteries seems fairly clear. We may instance such terms as *ἐνδύεσθαι*, *σύμφυτον*, *στίγματα*, *ἄρρητα*, *ῥήματα*, *σφραγίζεσθαι*, in addition to those quoted earlier in this chapter. This, however, does not necessarily imply that they meant the same thing for St. Paul as they did in the Mystery Religions. Many of his converts had undoubtedly been already members of pagan Mystery cults, and, like the broad-minded Apostle that he was, he did not disdain to employ terms and ideas already familiar to them in order to carry out his own purposes. Instances of this have already been referred to in the course of the chapter, as *e.g.* 1 Cor. ii. 1-10 and Gal. iv. 9 (the use of *στοιχεῖα*), and to these we may add Phil. iv. 8, where he seems to be describing the higher aspirations of those he would win for his own faith. Again many of the religious ideas current in the Mystery cults had remarkably close resemblances to the thought of the Old Testament, and with regard to these the Apostle and his converts found themselves on common ground.

3. *St. Paul's Mysticism.*—In this he is not necessarily indebted to Hellenistic or Oriental influences. We found that "mysticism" had been for centuries a feature of Jewish life, closely associated with the prophetic function, and that St. Paul's thought in this direction looks back directly to the Old Testament and to the apocalyptic books of later Judaism, more especially the book of Enoch. His attitude towards the outward phenomena, such as visions and ecstasies, associated with this phase of his character to which so much weight has been attached as proving his intimate relation with the Mystery Religions is definitely set forth in 1 Cor. xii., where they are

regarded as purely secondary in their importance, and valuable only as far as they tend to edify the Church.

4. *St. Paul's Sacramental Teaching.* — When we come to consider St. Paul's conception of the two great Christian ordinances it is more difficult to arrive at a definite decision as to the points of contact between the Apostle's teaching and that of the Mystery cults.

Clemen [1] certainly goes too far in equating his teaching with that of Zwingli and in denying any sacramental ideas in St. Paul's doctrine concerning Baptism and the Eucharist, and the same is true of Kennedy in a lesser degree. On the other hand the extreme advocates of the theory of Hellenistic influences upon St. Paul have certainly not proved either that the Sacraments were created by St. Paul as the direct consequence of his contact with Mystery Religions, or that in his teaching there is any reference to anything parallel to the quasi-magical effects attributed to the "mystery" lustrations and sacramental meals. Even K. Lake shows a decided tendency to attach too great an importance to the purely sacramental *ex opere operato* principle, and to leave out of sight the essential part played by the ethical and spiritual quality of faith in all the great central Pauline doctrines. That there was anything in St. Paul's teaching approaching the crude conception of a union with the god by partaking of the deity appears to be conclusively disproved.

To recur again to Dr. Bigg's words already quoted, the one all-important difference between St. Paul and

[1] Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, p. 223.

the Mystery Religions consists in this, that there is nothing in the latter which corresponds to the place which the Cross of Christ holds in the realm of St. Paul's thought and experience, and any real comparison between the two systems is therefore impossible.

CHAPTER VIII

THE LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Literature for Chapter VIII.

A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies.* 1901. E.T.
Light from the Ancient East. 1910. E.T.
Nägeli, *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus.* 1905.
J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek.* Vol. I. Prolegomena. 1908. *Cambridge Biblical Essays.* "New Testament Greek." 1909.
G. Milligan, *St Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians.* 1908.
The New Testament Documents. 1912.
C. L. W. Grimm, *Lexicon of New Testament Greek.* Edited by J. H. Thayer. 1909.
Thackeray, *A Grammar of Old Testament in Greek,* Vol. I. 1909.
"Lexical Notes from the Papyri." Moulton and Milligan. Papers in the *Expositor.* 1901–12.
H. A. A. Kennedy, *The Sources of New Testament Greek.* 1895.

I

The study of the language of the New Testament has brought into existence a considerable body of literature composed mainly of grammars and dictionaries, which have, in their turn, exercised a powerful influence upon all works connected with its exegesis. Now down to the very close of the nineteenth century the whole of this literature was based on the theory that the Greek of the New Testament, to use the words of Blass, one of the most eminent workers in this particular field, "was something peculiar, a language obeying its own laws."[1] New Testament

[1] Quoted in Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East,* p. 62.

Greek had then come to be regarded as a deviation from the main stream of the history of the development of the language as a whole, and there was assigned to it a position of isolation as a separate linguistic unit which, having no parallel in the known Greek of the period, demanded special treatment and a literature all its own. It was manifestly different from the literary Greek of the age, which was practically the only means of comparison available, and of which abundant examples have been preserved in the works of Polybius, Plutarch, Arrian, Lucian, and others, and it had little in common even with the language of Hellenistic Jews like Philo and Josephus. Explanations of this marked difference were sought for in various directions. First of all it was assumed that the peculiar language of the New Testament was largely due to the influence of the Septuagint, which is essentially "translation Greek" and demonstrates throughout the effects of the Hebrew original, both in grammar and style. As considerable portions of the New Testament documents are translations, not so much from Hebrew as from Aramaic, it was inferred that many of its linguistic idiosyncrasies were to be explained on the lines of the Greek of the Septuagint. Then again it was argued that many of the New Testament writers were Jews to whom Greek was to all intents and purposes a foreign language, and that in consequence their thought and style were governed by their Aramaic upbringing and surroundings even when they employed Greek.

Finally, the idea of a special New Testament Greek was supported by the theory of "mechanical inspiration," which encouraged the notion that it was in accordance with the fitness of things that the

sacred Scriptures should be produced in a language free from profanation by contact with secular writings, which might well be entitled "the language of the Holy Ghost." The language of the New Testament was for centuries then relegated to a position of dignified isolation, and was regarded as a separate linguistic unit under the name of "New Testament Greek."

The last decade of the nineteenth century, however, witnessed the dawn of a new movement which bids fair to revolutionise all previous conceptions of the true place of New Testament Greek in the history of language, with the result that much of the literature that has concerned itself with the linguistic interpretation of the New Testament has become obsolete and out of date. Much of the credit for this new movement must be placed to the account of Professor Adolf Deissmann of Berlin, but the signal services of Dr. Moulton and Dr. Milligan in the same field must not pass unnoticed. Chief among the factors at the root of this movement was the recent discovery of fresh and relevant evidence in great quantity in the shape of inscriptions, papyri, and ostraka. The acquisition of this new material was also followed by what was of even greater importance in connection with our subject, viz. the discovery of its significance. Inscriptions and papyri in considerable numbers had been collected during the earlier decades of the last century, but they lay neglected and forgotten in the British Museum. and in the principal museums on the Continent. A great impulse was, however, given to the study of this available material by the formation of societies for the purposes of exploration and archaeological survey, and by the labours of

individuals in the same direction, by means of which the already existing collections were considerably enriched by the addition of Hellenistic inscriptions from Italy, Greece, and Asia Minor.

Among these individuals Sir W. M. Ramsay, who has done pioneer work of the greatest value in discovering and deciphering Hellenistic inscriptions illustrating a comparatively low grade of culture in Asia Minor, deserves special recognition.

More important than the inscriptions was the perfect wealth of material unearthed from the tombs and rubbish heaps of Egypt in the shape of thousands of papyri and ostraka (broken pieces of crockery covered with writing).

Here again British enterprise and scholarship were to the fore in the persons of Drs. Grenfell and Hunt, whose names will be always remembered in connection with the famous *Logia* or *Sayings of Jesus* recovered from the ruins of Oxyrhynchus. This abundant store has now been subjected to wide and careful research, the results of which are manifest in such works as those of the Egypt Exploration Society and in the great collections of papyri from Berlin, Vienna, Paris, and America. Meanwhile a great German savant, Wilcken, published over 1500 short writings deciphered from Greek ostraka, collected from the museums of London, Paris, and Rome.[1] The value of the material thus collected is not confined to its quantity. It is equally noteworthy for its variety. Among it was a lost treatise of Aristotle and the work of some minor Greek poets, Bacchylides and Herodas, all of a literary character.[2] But it was the non-

[1] Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 44.
[2] Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, p. 3.

literary material thus brought to light that was destined to prove of prime importance in connection with the history of the Greek language, and of this, under the separate headings of papyri, inscriptions, and ostraka, it is necessary to give a short description.

(1) PAPYRI.—Among the papyri there have been discovered documents illustrating every phase and department of daily life among the subjects of the Roman Empire. They were principally recovered from the ruins of cities and villages of Upper Egypt, and a few only were discovered elsewhere, as *e.g.* at Herculaneum.

They cover in round numbers a period of a thousand years, and date from 311 B.C. to the seventh century A.D. In their variety they have been aptly compared to the contents of waste-paper baskets from a lawyer's office, a school, a farm, a shop, and an official government residence.[1]

Among them are included :

(*a*) *Legal documents*, such as wills, law reports, marriage settlements, contracts, and receipts.

(*b*) *Official documents*, as *e.g.* census returns, official orders, and petitions.

(*c*) *Private letters* of every kind and description, illustrating all grades of social rank, education, and culture among the writers.

(2) INSCRIPTIONS.—These cover a wide tract of country, representing Italy, Greece, and Asia Minor. Here the Greek is of a higher character on the whole than that of the papyri. This is only natural when we realise that the inscriptions were meant to defy the assaults of time, whereas the papyri were intended for the needs of the moment only. To quote Dr.

[1] Moulton, *op. cit.* p. 27.

Moulton: "In the inscriptions the Greek is in its best clothes; in the papyri it is in corduroys." [1]

(3) Ostraka.—The ostraka, or potsherds, were the writing material of the very poor. They cost nothing, and could be picked up freely from the rubbish heap attached to the nearest rich man's house. Their contents, as may be imagined, are often of the homeliest description, but they are by no means the least valuable portion of the new material, inasmuch as they proceed from the lowest grade of society, and enable us to picture the life of the peasant under the Empire, for which we had practically no evidence available before.

Such, then, was the new material provided by recent research, but its significance in connection with the study of New Testament Greek still remained to be discovered.

That this was eventually done was entirely due to the insight of Professor Deissmann, who in 1895 began to issue a series of volumes the influence of which upon the prevailing conceptions with regard to the language of the New Testament has been well-nigh incalculable. The main result of Deissmann's discovery was to demonstrate that the language in which the New Testament was written, far from being the isolated, unique linguistic unit with which all previous study had made us familiar, was simply the ordinary vernacular Greek spoken in the Graeco-Roman divisions of the Empire at that period.

Hellenistic Greek of the literary type was already known to us in the works of the writers that we have referred to at the beginning of this chapter, and the colloquial Greek of the cultured class was not

[1] Moulton, *op. cit.* p. 28.

altogether unknown. The Greek that the simple unlearned people of the Empire used in daily life and business seemed, however, to have entirely disappeared, until the ruins of Egypt gave up their treasures, and revealed that language in all its variety in the multitude of papyri and ostraka thence unearthed. The Hellenistic Greek of which we had anything like adequate knowledge, viz. that of the man of culture and of the writer, had, through the influence of Alexander's conquests and of Alexander's army, been moulded into one common language, practically free from all the dialectical differences of the Greek of the classical period and diffused throughout all the eastern provinces of the Empire. This tongue we were familiar with under the name of "Koinē" or "common Greek." Our knowledge of the real Greek "Koinē" was, however, manifestly deficient, and it was only completed through the recent discoveries, which have added to the two types of "Koinē" already available a third, viz. the non-literary language used by the mass of the people in ordinary daily life. Reference has already been made to the freedom of the literary "Koinē" of the period from the dialectal distinctions which in the age of classical Greek separated Attic from Ionic, and Ionic from Doric. The new texts afford the most ample evidence that this may also be affirmed of the non-literary vernacular Greek of this period. A comparison of the inscriptions of Asia Minor, *e.g.* with the papyri of Egypt, gives a language which is practically homogeneous, so that a traveller acquainted with this ordinary Greek could make himself understood without any difficulty throughout the length and breadth of the Graeco-Roman division of

the Empire. What the English language is in the British Empire of to-day may be asserted with practical certainty of the Greek "Koinē" in the greater part of the Roman world of that day.

The most interesting and fascinating features of the new material are undoubtedly contained in the letters, a few examples of which are here selected from the ample store found in Deissmann's volumes, and given in an English translation.

1. Letter from Demophon, a wealthy Egyptian, to Ptolemaeus, a police official, *circa* 245 B.C.: [1]

> Demophon to Ptolemaeus, greeting. Send us by all means the piper Petoys with both the Phrygian pipes and the others. And if it is necessary to spend anything, pay it. Thou shalt receive it from us. And send us also Zenobius the effeminate, with tabret, and cymbals, and rattles. For the women have need of him at the sacrifice. And let him also have raiment as fair as may be. And fetch also the kid from Aristion and send it to us.
>
> Yea, and if thou hast taken the slave, deliver him to Semphtheus that he may bring him to us. And send us also cheeses as many as thou canst, and new earthenware, and herbs of every kind, and delicacies if thou hast any.
>
> Farewell.
>
> Put them on board and guards with them who will help in bringing the boat over.

This letter gives us a glimpse of the domestic life of a well-to-do family. The father writes to a friend to ensure his assistance in making the necessary preparations for an approaching festival by ordering musicians, food, and crockery for him in the city. We note also the reference to the runaway slave.

2. Letter from Nearchus to Heliodorus, first or second century A.D. papyrus from Egypt: [2]

[1] Deissmann, *op. cit.* pp. 150-151. [2] *Ibid.* p. 162.

Nearchus . . . (to Heliodorus) . . . greeting. Since many . . . even unto taking ship, that they may learn about the works made by men's hands, I have done after this sort and undertook a voyage up and came to Soene and there where the Nile flows out, and to Libya, where Ammon sings oracles to all men, and I learnt goodly things, and I carved the names of my friends on the temples for a perpetual memory, the intercession . . .

(*Two lines washed out.*)

A little fragment of a travel letter and, therefore, interesting to the historian of civilisation. The reference to the prayer for his friends in the temple and to his inscribing their names on the temple walls, as if to make the intercession permanent, throws an important light upon the religious spirit of the age.

3. Letter from Irene, an Egyptian, to a family in mourning, second century A.D. papyrus from Oxyrhynchus:[1]

Irene to Taonnophris and Philo, good comfort.

I was as sorry and wept over the departed one as I wept for Didymas. And all things, whatsoever were fitting, I did, and all mine, Epaphroditus and Thermuthion and Philion and Apollonius and Plantas. But, nevertheless, against such things one can do nothing. Therefore comfort ye one another. Fare ye well. Athyr 1. (*28th October.*)

Irene, who has lost a child of her own, writes to her friend Taonnophris, who has recently experienced a similar loss. Her own personal sorrow enables her to sympathise to the full with her friend's grief. There is almost a Pauline touch in the words "Comfort ye one another."

4. Letter from Theon, an Egyptian boy, to his father Theon, second or third century A.D. papyrus from Oxyrhynchus:[2]

[1] Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 164. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 187-188.

Theon to Theon his father, greeting. Thou hast done well. Thou hast not carried me with thee to the town. If thou wilt not carry me with thee to Alexandria, I will not write thee a letter, nor speak thee, nor wish thee health. But if thou goest to Alexandria, I will not take hand from thee, nor greet thee again henceforth. If thou wilt not carry me, these things come to pass. My mother also said to Archelaus, "he driveth me mad: away with him." But thou hast done well. Thou hast sent me great gifts—locust beans. They deceived us there on the twelfth day, when thou didst sail. Finally send for me, I beseech thee. If thou sendest not, I will not eat nor drink. Even so. Fare thee well, I pray. Tybi 18. (*January* 13.)

A typical schoolboy's letter which speaks for itself. It is written in the language of the streets and the playground. There is no attempt at grammar, and the spelling of the original is atrocious. Incidentally it would seem from this letter that the "hunger strike" is as old as the second century A.D.

5. Letter from Pacysis, an Egyptian, to his son, about the third century A.D., an ostrakon from Thebes:[1]

Pacysis, the son of Patsebthis, to my son, greeting. Contradict not. Ye have dwelt there with a soldier. But receive him not till I come to you. Farewell.

I have inserted this as an interesting example of the poor man's letter written on a potsherd.

Now it is manifest from the contents of these few letters not only that the material contained in the papyri and ostraka as a whole is valuable in connection with the language of the Empire, but that it is hardly of less importance in view of the flood of light it throws upon the social and moral condition of the

[1] Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 191.

subjects of Rome at this time. This point may be illustrated in two directions.

First, the life of the larger cities of the Empire was sufficiently well known to us in the classical and historical writers of the period. The new texts have now thrown open a door which had hitherto been closed, and we are in a position to reconstruct a picture of life under the Empire as it existed in the small country towns and villages. Incidentally this is of no little value in the domain of New Testament history, because from the analogy of life in the small towns and villages of Egypt, as it is illustrated in the papyri and ostraka, we are able to depict the surroundings of our Lord and His disciples in Galilee, in small towns like Capernaum, and in villages like Nazareth. They take us among peasants, fishermen, soldiers, slaves, artisans, small tradespeople, and officials of a humble grade, *i.e.* into the midst of the lower and lower middle classes among whom Christianity first found a home. It was undoubtedly these who formed the bulk of the first Christian converts, although converts were by no means confined to this class, and numbered among them many of higher rank. The homely potsherds are specially valuable in this connection because they illustrate the daily life of the poorest and lowliest subjects of the Empire.

Secondly, they lead to a considerable modification of the view generally held as to the moral condition of the heathen world. The impression of the morals of heathen Rome that we derive from contemporary literature, whether sacred or profane, is on the whole dark and unfavourable. Now Deissmann [1] maintains

[1] Deissmann, *op. cit.* pp. 282-283.

that this impression is not based on reliable sources because our knowledge of the world of that day was confined to one section of it only, the upper and governing classes. The literature at our disposal reflected the opinions and habits of the higher grade of society, and much of our information was derived from the Fathers of the Church, who were frankly polemical, and, from the very nature of the case, prone to exaggeration. The papyri and ostraka, however, testify that among the great masses of the people many were leading useful, hard-working, and dependable lives, and that an intimate family feeling and friendship bound poor people together. Many of the new texts again are of a deeply religious character, and among them may be found epitaphs, prayers and dedications, private letters with a religious colouring, and amulets. Among the letters none are of greater interest than those which illustrate the life of the individual soul. Some of these letters have already been quoted, as *e.g.* the letter from Irene to the married couple who had just lost a son, and that from Nearchus, a man on his travels, describing how he had carved his friends' names on sacred places and prayed for them. Most interesting of all in this connection is a letter from Antonius Longus, a prodigal son, to his mother Nilus [1] expressing deep contrition for his wrong-doing in which the expressions "I have been chastened," "I know that I have sinned" occur. From these we may gather that, whatever the state of morality among the upper and governing classes may have been, among the poorer and humbler folk of the Empire the outlook was not so gloomy, and that in the villages and country

[1] Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 176.

districts there was a deep and earnest sense of religion, combined with much that made for decency and order.

II

We are now in a position to discuss the relevancy of these discoveries with reference to the Greek of the New Testament. If Deissmann's main contention is accepted, that the Greek of the papyri was the ordinary vernacular Greek of the Empire, his corollary, that we at last possess the very language in which the Apostles and Evangelists wrote and spoke, will not cause much difficulty. The analogy of Egypt, which is proved by the evidence of the papyri unearthed there to have been a bilingual country, enables us to understand the situation in Palestine, where Aramaic was the popular language, but where Greek was also available. The best modern parallel to this state of affairs is found in my own country, the Principality of Wales, in which Welsh is the common vernacular while English is practically within reach of all. That Aramaic was the language which our Lord and His Apostles habitually used is now fairly generally acknowledged, but it seems almost equally certain that most of the Apostles, if not all of them, knew Greek. Many authorities of great weight, as *e.g.* Driver, Sanday, and Zahn, are strongly of opinion that our Lord Himself was able to converse in that language, but Deissmann seems to deny this.[1]

The Greek of the New Testament would then differ but slightly from the universal language of the Eastern Empire, and where differences do occur these

[1] Deissmann's pronouncement in *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 57, is ambiguous and depends upon whether the phrase "did not speak Greek" means "did not know Greek."

are not due to any radical distinction between the Greek which the primitive Christian writers employed and the "Koinē" of the period, but are to be explained by the special conditions governing their work. Much of the New Testament consists of translation, either from the Old Testament Hebrew or from original Aramaic sources, and it is in this direction that we are to seek for an explanation of its many peculiarities, and not in its organic isolation from the common Greek of the age.

Every scholar conversant with the contents of dictionaries and grammars of New Testament Greek is aware that they were largely concerned with words which were supposed to be peculiar to the New Testament Scriptures, and with grammatical constructions which had no parallel in Hellenistic literary Greek. Many of these words were described as special creations to meet the peculiar needs of a language of religion, while the syntactical idiosyncrasies were generally explained as "Semitisms" or "Hebraisms." The number of "Biblical" New Testament words, *i.e.* words only found in the Septuagint or in the New Testament itself, was in a standard work like Dr. Kennedy's *Sources of New Testament Greek* estimated as being over 550, and the significance of the latest research is manifest when we find it now confidently stated that there are not more than fifty which can be pronounced to be absolutely peculiar to the New Testament.[1] So, again, many of the strange idioms generally attributed to the influence of Aramaic upon the writers are found to be in fairly common use in the ordinary language of the day, as illustrated by the inscriptions, papyri, and ostraka.

[1] Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 71.

A few Semitisms undoubtedly remain, such as the constant use of *ἰδού* (= Behold) in the Gospels,[1] but even such apparent solecisms as the use of the instrumental *ἐν* with the dative;[2] the paratactic style of the Fourth Gospel; and the unusual prominence given to the first person in the same Gospel are proved to have been in use, and to have their parallels in the material so recently brought to light.

Similarly a short selection of words, all of which are classified in the latest edition of Thayer's *Grimm* as "Biblical," but which are now found in the inscriptions and papyri, will serve to illustrate the wholesale change in our conception of the vocabulary of the New Testament which has been brought about by the recent discoveries: *ὀνικός* (used with *μύλος* "a mill-stone"), *ἀφιλάργυρον*, a great Christological term like *πρωτότοκος*; characteristic Pauline words like *συγκληρονόμος*, *ἀναθεματίζω*,, *ἐπικατάρατος*; and others such as *ἀρχιποίμην*, *προσκυνητής*, *ἐπισυναγωγή* and *λογία* (a collection, a word formerly supposed to have been coined by St. Paul).

Again, the meaning of words and phrases in the New Testament, whose exact significance it was difficult to determine, is elucidated by means of these documents, as *e.g.*:

(1) The use of *ἀπέχω* in St. Matt. vi. 2 (*ἀπέχουσι τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν*: "they have their reward"), which is found both in the papyri and ostraka, and is a technical term for drawing up a receipt.

(2) *πήρα* (a scrip or wallet) was a beggar's collecting bag.

(3) *ἀναστροφή*, which in classical Greek means

[1] Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament, Greek*, pp. 11-12.
[2] Cf. *ἐν ῥάβδῳ*, 1 Cor. iv. 21.

simply "manner of life" without any reference to morals, is in the vernacular of the papyri used in a definitely ethical sense as in the New Testament.

(4) Ἀδελφός is a member of a community.

(5) Δίδωμι ἐργασίαν (cf. St. Luke xii. 58, δὸς ἐργασίαν "give diligence"), which is not a Latinism, the equivalent of *do operam*, as described in Thayer's *Grimm*, but a good Hellenistic expression.

(6) Συναίρω λόγον (cf. συνᾶραι λόγον "to take account," St. Matt. xviii. 23), is a technical phrase, and by no means peculiar to the New Testament.

(7) Δεισιδαίμων. This is a word in which I am specially interested, inasmuch as in my book, *St. Paul the Orator*, I maintained that it must have been used by St. Paul at Athens in a commendatory sense, as against Bishop Chase's assertion that it was invariably used in the contrary sense. According to Deissmann (*op. cit.* p. 283), wherever the word is found in the papyri the context implies commendation, *i.e.* the word has the meaning "religious" and not "superstitious."

We may also draw attention to the manner in which the social and religious history of the New Testament world is illustrated in the new texts.

The following may be noted as instances of this process:

(*a*) The enrolment described in St. Luke ii. 3, "They all went to enroll themselves every one into his own city," is confirmed by an edict of G. Vibius Maximus, Governor of Egypt, A.D. 104, in which the exact terms "enrolment by households" and "to return to their domestic hearths" appear.[1]

(*b*) The cost of sparrows. Cf. "Two sparrows sold for a

[1] Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 267.

farthing" (St. Matt. x. 29); "Five sparrows sold for two farthings" (St. Luke xii. 6). The cheapness of sparrows as food, the fact that they were sold in pairs or fives, and their market price as a farthing the pair, are all supported by an extract from a maximum tariff of Diocletian.[1]

(*c*) Popular lists of virtues and vices are often found on counters used in a game resembling draughts. The entire list used by St. Paul in 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, has been found substantially word for word on these counters.[2]

(*d*) Such details as the unpopularity of publicans, so frequently emphasised in the New Testament, and the value of the tribute (two drachmae, St. Matt. xvii. 24) are confirmed by the papyri.

The papyri are perhaps most interesting and most useful because of the way in which they help us to understand the letters of St. Paul. We may refer to words like *στίγματα* (Gal. vi. 17), which is explained as a species of tattooing of the worshipper in honour of his god;[3] phrases like "I call God for a witness" (2 Cor. i. 23), "I have kept faith" (2 Tim. iv. 7), and "If any will not work neither let him eat" which Deissmann pronounces to be a bit of good old workshop morality.[4]

Again, some of the Pauline legal terms and ideas, such as those connected with slavery and freedom, debt and its forgiveness, and the meaning of such terms as advocate and *διαθήκη* (which invariably refers to a Will), are explained by Hellenistic popular law as set forth in these documents.

Thus the Greek word *λύτρον* is always associated with the money paid for the manumission of slaves, and St. Paul in expanding and adapting Christ's saying (St. Mark x. 45) to the Greek world was

[1] Deissmann, *op. cit.* pp. 271-272. [2] *Ibid.* p. 320.
[3] Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 349.
[4] Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 318.

accommodating himself to the intellectual capacity of his hearers. Ὀφειλή, which was supposed to be a strictly New Testament word, is the current term for "debt" in the papyri.[1]

But the most important bond between the papyri and the Pauline literature consists in the manner in which the letters contained in the former enable us to picture the exact form and appearance of St. Paul's own letters. Taking the ordinary papyrus letter as an example, we may infer that St. Paul wrote on a papyrus sheet 5 to 5½ inches wide by 9 to 11 inches long. One of these sheets would contain a short note like the Epistle to Philemon, but where more than one sheet was required they were joined together at the ends and formed into a long roll. The sheet was covered on one side only with writing arranged in two parallel columns. We know from the Apostle's own statement that he generally dictated his letters, contenting himself with inscribing the final salutation in his own handwriting. This custom is exemplified in many of the papyri letters where the signature is written in a different hand from that of the main body. Even the ink used by the Apostle is known to us both as to its appearance and composition.

The parallels between the Pauline letters and those of the papyri are not confined to the details of shape and appearance, and it will be seen from the specimen letter printed below that the style, plan, and some of the most characteristic expressions were assimilated to those of the current correspondence of the period.

A letter from a mother to her children discovered in the Faiyûm: end of second or beginning of third century A.D.:

[1] Deissmann, *op. cit.* pp. 320-366.

Serapias to her children Ptolemaios and Apolinaria and Ptolemaios, with many greetings. First and foremost I pray for your good health which I deem of all things the most essential. I join in worship before my god Serapis, praying that I may hear that you are well, even as I pray for your general welfare. I rejoiced when I received your letter telling me that you were well recovered. Salute Ammonous with his wife and children and also those that love you. Cyrilla saluteth you and Hermias the daughter of Hermias, Hermanoubis the nurse, Athenais . . . Cyrilla, Casia, . . . Empis, in fact all who are here. Answer therefore my inquiry regarding yourself, what you are about, for you know that if I receive tidings of you I rejoice in your well-being. I pray that you may prosper.[1]

A mere glance at this letter reveals the many features it has in common with the Pauline letters. It contains an address, a prayer, a rejoicing, a request, and closes with the usual salutations, all of which correspond closely with the plan and contents of the normal Apostolic letter. The very phrases concerning the prayer and the rejoicing remind us strongly of similar expressions and sentiments on the part of St. Paul, as *e.g.* in Ephes. i. 16, Col. i. 9, 2 Cor. vii. 7, Phil. ii. 20, Philemon 7.

The word used so frequently in this letter with reference to bodily health [2] is again a favourite word with St. Paul, but in his case the anxiety expressed is not so much for the soundness of the body as for that of the faith of his spiritual children.

To sum up this part of our subject, the net result of these discoveries and their study is to make it difficult, if not impossible, to speak any longer of New Testament Greek as an isolated and separate

[1] From Milligan, *Epistles to the Thessalonians*, p. 128.
[2] ὑγιαίνειν.

linguistic unit. The evidence adduced in the course of this chapter, which is, after all, but a small fraction of the evidence that is available, leads to one conclusion only, and we are now bound to recognise that the Greek of the New Testament is, on the whole, one with the universal vernacular Greek which obtained throughout the dominion of Imperial Rome in Italy and the East.

III

We have not exhausted the significance of the "Koinē" documents when we have discussed their influence upon our conceptions of the character of New Testament Greek. They open up another wide and important field of enquiry, which we may put in this form—What light does the new evidence throw upon our estimate of the various books of the New Testament as literature?

This problem was to a large degree incapable of solution previous to the discovery of these documents, because, speaking generally, the New Testament was unique, and was practically the only example we possessed of the literature of that particular type. That the many books of which it was composed did not all represent the same level of culture was quite apparent, but as there was nothing to compare them with it was difficult to classify them or to determine their rank as literature. This difficulty has now been removed, and we find ourselves in the presence of a *quasi*-literature which exhibits an even greater variety of culture than the New Testament, so that it is hardly too much to say that every book in the New Testament has its parallel among the papyri

documents.[1] What has always been regarded as *the literature* of our period was in form a mere imitation of the Attic Greek of the fourth and fifth centuries B.C., but it was Attic Greek with a difference, *i.e.* with a considerable admixture of elements derived from the colloquial language, and containing a large proportion of words and constructions which would certainly not have commended themselves to the Athenian writers of the " Golden Age " of Greek letters. Now, that the books of the New Testament, taken as a whole, bore no relation to the literature of the " Atticising " type needs no proof, and we shall not go far astray if we affirm that the majority of its writers had not the slightest idea that they were producing literature at all. There is in it no straining after literary effect, and any conscious imitation of a model, however exalted, is conspicuous by its absence. Perhaps nothing is more characteristic of the New Testament writings as a whole than their perfect simplicity and naturalness. Even the Epistles of St. Paul are not " epistles " in the literary sense of the term (with the possible exception of that to the Romans), but simple letters, called forth by the immediate needs of the situation, betraying no pretensions to literary style and form, and far removed from the formal " epistle," which was an artistic and carefully composed document, intended for the eye of the public. It would seem then that the greater proportion of the New Testament belongs to the non-literary rather than the literary type of Hellenistic writings, and that we have to seek for parallels to it in that class of document which is revealed in the papyri.

[1] Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, p. 4.

With these documents and Dr. Moulton [1] as our guides, it now becomes possible to classify approximately the writers of the New Testament according to their rank in the world of education and culture.

Starting from the lowest rung of the ladder, the two books which betray the least knowledge of Greek culture are St. Mark's Gospel and the Apocalypse. The author of the latter is guilty of some striking deviations from correct Greek, the most remarkable of which is found perhaps in the first chapter.[2] We are the more surprised at these aberrations because he expresses himself in Greek with great fluency. But Greek is to him evidently a secondary language, whose idioms and constructions he has never thoroughly mastered.

St. Mark's Gospel exhibits the lowest stage of Greek culture of all the New Testament writers, and comes closest to the type of the less educated papyri. Some of this is doubtless due to the fact that his original sources were Aramaic, and to this we must attribute the presence of so much "translation Greek" throughout the Gospel.

A little removed from St. Mark is the writer of the First Gospel, who, although a Jew in outlook and sentiment, employs the Hellenistic Greek of the ordinary type. That his knowledge of this language was superior to that possessed by St. Mark is demonstrated by his frequent and fairly successful attempts to improve the style and diction of the latter.

The "Johannine literature" would seem to belong to the same grade of Greek as that of St. Matthew's Gospel, and we may place in the same class the

[1] *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, pp. 464-505.
[2] *E.g.* i. 5, where he writes ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πιστός.

Epistles of St. James, St. Jude, and 1 St. Peter, all of whom, in spite of their Jewish birth and education, are free and vigorous in their use of the language. This confirms the statement in a preceding page that Palestine, like Egypt, where, as the papyri prove, peasants, slaves, and schoolboys express themselves in Greek with absolute ease, was a bilingual country. The writers that we have enumerated all used Aramaic as their native tongue, and Greek was to them only a subsidiary language.

We now come to deal with writers to whom Greek was practically a primary language, although in the case of one of them, St. Paul, Aramaic was equally at his command. Among these we include, besides St. Paul, St. Luke, and the authors of the Epistle to the Hebrews and 2 St. Peter.

St. Luke, as befits a member of a learned profession, expresses himself generally in the language of the more cultured section of the Hellenistic community. His diction, however, approaches that of the preceding type in those sections of his work where, as *e.g.* in the early chapters of the Acts, the scenes are placed in Palestine and he is influenced by the cruder style of his sources. When, however, he comes to describe the great Pauline mission in the centres of Hellenistic civilisation, he reverts to the more cosmopolitan style which was natural to him. In his Gospel he also, like the writer of the first Gospel, and to a greater degree, corrects and improves upon the Greek of St. Mark.

A complete knowledge of ordinary Greek was an absolute necessity to one whose main work was destined, as St. Paul's was, to lie in the great Hellenistic provinces of the Empire. His Greek, however,

is certainly not that of the Atticists, but that of the colloquial language of the day. Some of the most striking features which mark his style were no doubt due to the fact that his letters were as a rule dictated, *i.e.* they were spoken and written, and were therefore speeches and not treatises. These reflect in every line the ruggedness and impetuosity of one who never dreamt that his words, often the outcome of burning zeal or of anxious fears, and uttered for the occasion only, were to become literature, and, least of all, sacred literature.

The Epistle to the Hebrews and 2 St. Peter stand in a class by themselves. They both approach the literary style of the Atticists, and contain none of those lapses from correct grammar and idiom of which even St. Luke and St. Paul are sometimes guilty. Of the two, 2 St. Peter is the more artificial. The Greek of the latter is Greek learned from books, and has been compared by Dr. Abbott to the English of an Indian Babu.

Before closing this chapter I would point out that I have endeavoured throughout to reproduce the conclusions that Deissmann and his followers, notably Dr. Moulton,[1] have derived from the study of the papyri and ostraka as it affects the Greek of the New Testament. At the same time I am not quite satisfied that Deissmann, in his natural enthusiasm on behalf of his new theory, has not gone too far in some directions. In his emphatic declarations that the New Testament is written in the language of the people, and is, therefore, non-literary, he seems to have forgotten the fact that the language of the common people has sometimes embodied literature,

[1] Moulton in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 484.

and literature of the very highest type, as in the case of *The Pilgrim's Progress*. His estimates of St. Paul's position in the social world, " a weaver of cloth " and nothing more, and of his Epistles in the world of literature are both lower than the facts demand. The eulogy of love in 1 Cor. xiii. is surely literature of the noblest character, and the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, one if not both of which were intended to be read in a large circle of Churches, are certainly not written in a colloquial style, but in a style which is dignified and stately, and which, in some respects, reminds us of the diction of the great prophets of Israel. Deissmann's conception of the educational standard of the early Church errs in the same direction. Here he has left out of sight the enormous influence of the Old Testament and of the Synagogue upon the Jewish and Greek-Jewish communities, which produced a higher state of knowledge and culture among the first Christian converts than Deissmann is prepared to allow. Now that we have uttered our protest against some of his more extreme conclusions, we readily acknowledge the enormous debt which the study of the language of the New Testament owes to the insight and industry of Dr. Deissmann and to the labours of his able co-workers in our own country.

BOOK II

THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT RESEARCH

LITERATURE DEALING WITH THE NEW TESTAMENT AS A WHOLE

Introductions to the New Testament.
B. W. Bacon. 1900.
A. Jülicher. 1906. E.T.
A. S. Peake. 1909.
Th. Zahn. 1909. E.T.
J. Moffatt. 1911.

History of the Apostolic Age.
A. C. M'Giffert. 1897.
Vernon Bartlet 1900.
C. Weizsäcker 1902.

J. Moffatt, *The Historical New Testament.* 1901.
A. Harnack, *Die Christologie der altchristlichen Literatur.* 1904.
B. W. Bacon, *The Making of the New Testament.* 1912.
G. Milligan, *New Testament Documents.* 1913.
A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies.* 1901. *Light from the Ancient East.* 1910
J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek.* Vol. I. *Prolegomena.* 1908.

CHAPTER I

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

Literature for Chapter I.

Rushbrooke, *Synopticon.* 1880.
Abbott and Rushbrooke, *Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels.* 1884.
Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel.* 1901.
J. Armitage Robinson, *The Study of the Gospels.* 1902.
A. Wright, *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek.* 1903.
E. D. Burton, *Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem.* 1904.
J. Estlin Carpenter, *The First Three Gospels.* 1904.
Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien.* 1905.
F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission.* 1906.
G. Salmon, *The Human Elements in the Gospels.* 1907.
W. C. Allen, *St. Matthew.* 1907.
A. Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus.* 1908.
H. B. Swete, *St. Mark.* 1908.
A. Plummer, *St. Luke.* 1906.
H. L. Jackson, "The Present State of the Synoptic Problem," *Cambridge Biblical Essays.* 1909.
J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae.* Second edition, 1909.
V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents.* Part II., 1909.
B. W. Bacon, *The Beginnings of the Gospel Story.* 1909.
W. Sanday (edited by), *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem.* 1911.
E. R. Buckley, *Introduction to the Synoptic Problem.* 1911.
W. W. Holdsworth, *Gospel Origins.* 1913.
Articles on the Gospels, Logia, etc., in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* and *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*

The most notable achievement in the department of recent New Testament criticism is undoubtedly the fairly general agreement arrived at with regard to the mutual relations of the first three Gospels. Differences of opinion still exist with reference to the details of the prevailing Synoptic scheme, but the

main lines upon which the solution of the Synoptic problem is to be attained would now seem to be definitely decided upon.

The following may be noted as points in regard to which a considerable amount of unanimity has been reached:

1. The problem is a documentary one. Oral tradition is only a subordinate and comparatively unimportant factor in the composition of the Gospels and does not adequately explain the relations between them.

2. The documents upon which the Synoptic tradition is based are Greek and not Aramaic documents.

3. The Second Gospel is the earliest of the three, and this Gospel, or a document approximately identical with it, lay before the authors of the First and Third Gospels, who embodied it almost in its entirety in their writings, and used it as a framework into which they introduced materials from other sources.

4. A second principal document is also common to St. Matthew and St. Luke, consisting mainly of discourses and sayings of Jesus, which the two Evangelists independently combined with their Marcan document.

Literature dealing with the Synoptic Problem.—It is a matter of no little gratification that in the study of the Synoptic Problem one has not to depend mainly upon Continental scholars as is the case with so many important critical questions. In this instance English scholarship is very much to the fore, and the student will find the problem most adequately and thoroughly treated in Stanton's *The Gospels as Historical Docu-*

ments, Part II., Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae*, Burkitt's *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, and more particularly in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* edited by Dr. Sanday, where all the main factors are discussed with the greatest fulness and with a perfect wealth of detail. A most excellent summary of the whole question will be found in Holdsworth's *Gospel Origins*, a most suggestive book.

I. The Oral Hypothesis

The oral hypothesis, which was in considerable vogue from the close of the eighteenth century to within recent times, has now been abandoned by the great majority of New Testament scholars. According to this theory all the Synoptic Gospels were based upon a primitive Gospel drawn up by the Apostles, or by one of them, St. Peter or St. Matthew, which, although unwritten, became fixed and stereotyped by constant repetition and by the use of the catechetical method. Much stress was laid upon the extraordinary extent to which memory was cultivated in the East in order to account for the fixity and accuracy of this traditional Gospel. This unwritten Gospel, which was Palestinian in origin and Aramaic in language, was first reduced to writing by St. Mark, and later on another version was produced which became our First Gospel. Later still St. Luke, using this Aramaic Gospel in conjunction with St. Mark's, which had now been translated into Greek, issued the Third Gospel. It was upon some such hypothesis as this that Dr. Westcott explained the history of the Gospels, and the theory is still strenuously advocated

by Dr. Arthur Wright,[1] but it no longer commends itself to the general body of Biblical scholars. It entirely fails to give a rational explanation of the Synoptic phenomena with their intricate coincidences and variations. The weakness of the theory is forcibly demonstrated by Professor Burkitt[2] who points out that, if the primitive source had been a fixed oral tradition, the incidents identically related in all three Gospels would have been to a large extent the central points of the Ministry and not a critical selection of anecdotes. In the story of the Resurrection, the Words from the Cross, and the narrative of the Last Supper, all the authorities might have been expected to agree even in detail, but they do not, whereas in small and unimportant particulars such as the command "Arise" in the miracle of the healing of "the man sick of the palsy," Herod's alarm about Jesus, and the fact that the Pharisees when they asked about the tribute money began by assuring our Lord that "He taught the way in truth," all three Synoptics agree verbally. If there had been an oral tradition, fixed and definite, the property of the whole Church, it must have been authoritative, and the Evangelists could not possibly have taken such liberties with it as the phenomena of the Gospels show they did. A documentary source, on the other hand, is definite, but not necessarily authoritative, and need not preclude free handling on the part of those who employ it.

But although the oral hypothesis as explaining the Synoptic phenomena as a whole has now been abandoned it is still allowed that oral tradition exercised a

[1] Wright, *Synopsis of the Gospels*, p. xiv. f.
[2] Burkitt, *op. cit.* chap. ii.

considerable influence upon certain specified sections of the Gospels. Hawkins,[1] *e.g.*, is of opinion that St. Luke's Passion-Narrative, which varies considerably from that found in the other two Gospels, is largely based upon the use of a special oral tradition which he found at his disposal. Stanton[2] also urges that some passages in those sections of St. Luke which are peculiar to it were gathered by the Evangelist from oral sources. He mentions in particular the accounts of incidents in the history of the Passion and of the appearances of the Risen Christ which are peculiar to this Gospel. The most considerable surrender to the oral theory is made by Vernon Bartlet in his essay on "Sources of St. Luke's Gospel" in the *O.S.S.P.*,[3] of which we shall have more to say later on in the chapter. He expounds the theory that Q, or as he prefers to call it "the basal Apostolic tradition," was not reduced to writing until it appeared in that form as a part of St. Luke's Gospel and that Matthew embodied it in an oral rather than a written form. Dr. Bartlet stands alone in his advocacy of this particular theory, and it does not seem likely to command any wide acceptance.

II. The Basal Documents Greek, and not Aramaic

The theory that behind the three Synoptic Gospels there lay an Aramaic or Hebrew Gospel which was translated and embodied by each of the three Evangelists in turn, which is advocated by Resch, E. A. Abbott, Wellhausen, and Allen, is now generally

[1] *O.S.S.P.* p. 92. These letters are used throughout this chapter to denote the *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem.*

[2] Stanton, *op. cit.* pp. 239-240.

[3] *O.S.S.P.* pp. 315-362.

rejected. It is felt that the amount of verbal agreement between all the three Gospels, and between the First and Third in considerable portions of the matter that is common to them, is far too great to be adequately explained by three separate translations of one original source, and that it is hardly conceivable that the verbal resemblances could arise from the accidental choice of the same expressions by different translators. The relation between the Gospels is, therefore, to be explained only upon the supposition of Greek and not Aramaic or Hebrew documental sources.

III. The Marcan Document

The priority of St. Mark is now accepted by all critics of any weight with the important exception of Zahn, who still maintains that in many points Mark is secondary to Matthew. Zahn's [1] theory is a revival of that of Grotius who held that Mark used the Hebrew Gospel written by the Apostle Matthew, and that the translator of the latter in turn made use of Mark's rendering for those parts which he found included in Mark's Gospel. Zahn has, however, no following among scholars on this point, and the theory need not detain us.

The use of St. Mark by the authors of the First and Third Gospels as one of their main sources seems proved beyond dispute. In support of this statement the following details may be adduced:

Out of 661 verses in St. Mark all but 50 are found in St. Matthew or St. Luke, and further, 816 verses out of 1068 in St. Matthew (more than three-fourths) and 798 out of 1149 in St. Luke (more than two-thirds)

[1] Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. ii. p. 601 f., E.T.

occur within the Marcan framework which both the first and third Evangelists adopted as their own. Thus practically every section of St. Mark is found in St. Matthew or St. Luke, or in both combined, and the order of St. Mark's incidents is, with hardly an exception, preserved in the one or the other, *i.e.* where St. Matthew deserts it St. Luke keeps it, or *vice versâ*. The actual phraseology is often preserved by both, and still more often by one where the other has changed it, all of which points to the conclusion that St. Mark, or a document approximately identical with it, underlies St. Matthew and St. Luke. But when we come to consider the question whether this Marcan source was our Second Gospel in the form in which we have it, or another document virtually identical with it but differing from it in numerous details, we are confronted with a wide divergence of opinion.

The factors which constitute the problem to be solved here may be summarised as follows :—

(*a*) Sections of St. Mark which are not found in St. Matthew or St. Luke :

(1) iii. 19*b*-21. "He is mad."

(2) iv. 26-29. The parable of the seed growing secretly.

(3) viii. 22-26. The healing of the blind man at Bethsaida.

(4) xiv. 51-52. The young man with the linen cloth.

(*b*) Sections of St. Mark omitted by St. Matthew or St. Luke :

(1) St. Matthew omits ix. 38-40. The stranger who exorcised in the name of Jesus.

(2) St. Luke omits i. 16-20, iii. 19*b*-30, iv. 26-34, vi. 1-6*a*, and the whole of the section vi. 45–viii. 26.

(c) A number of cases in which St. Matthew and St. Luke agree in using a word or phrase not used in St. Mark, or in omitting touches or statements, or where one of the three Gospels differs from the other two in points of detail.

These are summarised by Sanday as follows:[1]

(1) The same or similar words are used in different senses or with a different reference. Cf. Mark xi. 3 with Matt. xxi. 3.

(2) Sometimes the same or similar words are assigned to different speakers. Cf. Mark vi. 14, Matt. xiv. 2, with Luke ix. 7.

(3) In one Gospel we sometimes have in the form of a speech what in another is part of a narrative, and in one Gospel we have a question where in another there is a direct statement. Cf. Mark. v. 30 with Luke viii. 46.

(4) *Examples of Diverse Application.*—Cf. Matt. iii. 5 with Luke iii. 3, "All the region round Jordan" went out to John, with John "came into all the region round about Jordan"; Mark vi. 3, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" with Matt. xiii. 55, "Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary?"

(5) *Cases of Inversion of Order.*—The best known instance of this is the transposition of the second and third Temptations. Cf. Matt. iv. 5-10 and Luke iv. 5-12

The problem before us then is how to account for these phenomena. Speaking generally we may say that three different solutions are offered for our acceptance by recent criticism.

1. The Ur-Marcus Theory.—According to this

[1] *O.S.S.P.* pp. 6-8.

hypothesis no one of the three Evangelists was dependent upon any one of the others, but all three used freely an earlier Gospel, the Ur-Marcus, which corresponded most closely to the Second Gospel and contained both narrative and discourse. The common origin of the documentary source would account for the resemblances between the three Gospels, and editorial freedom would account for the differences. Moffatt [1] is among the few who now advocate this position. He identifies Ur-Marcus with the Marcan source mentioned by Papias, and contends that Mark's name was attached to the canonical Gospel because it was based on this original Marcan work. He departs, however, from the complete Ur-Marcus theory in urging that although St. Mark is based on this primitive source St. Matthew and St. Luke have used our St. Mark in preference to it. The existence of Ur-Marcus is strongly opposed by Burkitt, Holdsworth, and Sanday. The only places which necessitate the hypothesis of an Ur-Marcus are those where St. Matthew and St. Luke agree against St. Mark. Now, there are only twenty or twenty-one of these passages, and Burkitt [2] holds that in most cases this agreement is best explained as being due to special and fairly obvious causes. Holdsworth [3] finds considerable difficulty in understanding why a new book like our Second Gospel, so little different from the older Ur-Marcus, should ever have been written. If Ur-Marcus was longer than the canonical Mark it is possible to assign to it a considerable number of sections now preserved in St. Matthew and St. Luke which are not so easily explained as

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 192. [2] Burkitt, *op. cit.* chap. ii.
[3] Holdsworth, *op. cit.* p. 108.

derived from Matthew's and Luke's other sources. If it were shorter the additions in our St. Mark are merely the verses peculiar to it, and these are so very few (about fifty in number only) that it is hardly conceivable that a new book could have been thought necessary for their incorporation.

Sanday [1] rejects the idea of an Ur-Marcus or older form of the Gospel, because far the greater number of the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark are due to the use by the former of a recension of the text of St. Mark different from that from which all the extant MSS. of that Gospel are descended. They belong to a later form of the text rather than an earlier.

2. Three Different Editions of the Second Gospel.—The most popular solution is undoubtedly that which explains the phenomena referred to above by the hypothesis that in St. Mark, St. Matthew, and St. Luke we have three different editions of a Marcan document. Stanton,[2] N. P. Williams,[3] Holdsworth,[4] although somewhat at variance as to details, agree on the point that these three Gospels represent three stages in the evolution of this Marcan document. Stanton and Holdsworth are at one in finding the earliest form of this document in the Third Gospel, a later form in the First Gospel, and a final edition in our canonical St. Mark. N. P. Williams defines the exact character of the different versions somewhat more strictly, and contends that in the last thirty years of the first century A.D. the Gospel was current in three recensions:

(*a*) Our present Gospel without either the great

[1] Sanday, *O.S.S.P.* p. 21.
[2] Stanton, *op. cit.* p. 203.
[3] Williams in *O.S.S.P.* p. 421.
[4] Holdsworth, *op. cit.* pp. 109-129.

interpolation (Mark vi. 45–viii. 26) or chap. xiii. (this was the original form).

(*b*) Our present Gospel without the great interpolation but including chap. xiii. (the form used by St. Luke).

(*c*) Our present Gospel as it stands (the form used in St. Matthew).

He adds that (*b*) and (*c*) may be second and third editions of the Gospel published in his later years by Mark himself. He differs from Stanton and Holdsworth in pushing the process one stage further back, and in refusing to discover any material difference between our Second Gospel and its reproduction in St. Matthew.

The question of the three different editions of the Marcan document is advocated so fully and so suggestively by Holdsworth that it will not be out of place to reproduce some of his main arguments here. The three versions of the document are placed by him as follows :

(1) An earlier form which was Palestinian in origin and probably written at Caesarea by Mark.

(2) A later edition of Mark's work written when the Evangelist was in Egypt, and on behalf of a Jewish-Christian community.

(3) Our St. Mark, written at a later date still in the interests of a Gentile-Jewish Church such as that which was in existence at Rome about the seventh decade of the first century.

The first edition was used by Luke in the compilation of his Gospel, and the second edition was combined with Q at Alexandria by the author of our first Gospel, who thus produced St. Matthew.

The following reasons are suggested as showing

that St. Mark is secondary to St. Matthew and St. Luke in those places where the three Gospels have a common origin :

(1) The references to the Baptist in St. Mark indicate a later production for a Gentile Church such as existed in Rome, with which the Gospel was associated from a very early date. Interest in the Baptist and his doings would be very slight here, which explains the briefer notices relating to him in this Gospel as compared with the other two.

(2) The vivid touches in St. Mark which are absent in the other Gospels and which would not have been omitted by the first and third Evangelists if they had been present in their copies of St. Mark.

(3) The use of the word *εὐαγγέλιον*. This word occurs in St. Mark with considerable frequency and sometimes in an absolute sense. It is never found in St. Luke and never used absolutely in St. Matthew.

(4) *Pauline Features.*—In St. Mark the death of Christ is emphasised in a way which is very marked as compared with the parallels in St. Matthew and St. Luke, and one passage (x. 45) contains the word *λύτρον*, which is only used here in the New Testament, although its derivative *ἀπολύτρωσις* is frequent in St. Paul. If this was present in Luke's copy why did he omit this Pauline touch ?

(5) A great many names are included in St. Mark which are lacking in parallels in the other Gospels. The tendency to insert names is most marked in the Apocryphal Gospels, and their presence in the Second Gospel indicates a comparatively late writer.

Mr. Holdsworth also maintains that this theory considerably simplifies the problem of the reconstruction of Q. The teaching of the Baptist, the story of

15652

the Baptism and Temptation of Jesus, the healing of the Centurion's servant, as they appear in St. Matthew and St. Luke are generally attributed to Q, because Mark's account of the first three is exceedingly brief, while the fourth is not mentioned at all. This makes Q consist of narrative and discourse, a conclusion strenuously denied by many scholars. Holdsworth removes this difficulty by the suggestion that these passages do not belong to Q at all but to the earlier editions of the Marcan document, and that they were afterwards modified or omitted by Mark for certain specific reasons. He wrote down his memoirs of St. Peter's teaching more than once; and in the earlier editions, the one prepared in Palestine and the other in the interests of a Jewish-Christian community of the Dispersion, a full account of the Baptist's ministry and of his relation to our Lord would be entirely in place. These subjects, however, would be mentioned in the briefest way possible in a later edition intended for Rome, for a Church which was largely Gentile. The earlier editions would also naturally include the account of the coming of the Centurion, because the point of our Lord's words on that occasion was that Israel had failed to evince the faith which He had found in this Gentile, a condition of affairs which was self-evident when the last edition of the Gospel made its appearance.

3. Sanday's Solution.[1]—Dr. Sanday is not convinced that it is necessary to admit either the existence of an Ur-Marcus or a threefold edition of Mark's original document, and suggests that the divergences and difficulties associated with the material common to the three Gospels are intelligible on other grounds.

[1] Sanday, *O.S.S.P.* pp. 11-22.

He is of opinion that they can be explained (1) by physiological conditions and (2) by external conditions.

(1) *Psychological Conditions.*—(*a*) The Evangelists were historians and not mere copyists tied down to the text which lay before them, and as such they considered themselves entitled to reproduce it freely and not slavishly, and to tell the story over again in their own words.

(*b*) And yet the Gospels are not exactly histories. The Evangelists are not content to narrate facts simply as facts but are essentially concerned with a belief as growing out of the facts. Luke writes to strengthen the confidence of Theophilus in the truths in which he had been already instructed. Mark indicates his object when he calls his work "The Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God," and Matthew's purpose is equally apparent in the constant stress laid on the fulfilment of prophecy. The fact that the Evangelists were historians, and historians who wrote with a definite moral purpose, enables us to understand why they did not painfully transcribe the older texts on which they relied, *i.e.* St. Mark and Q, and did not feel themselves called upon to reproduce them verbally. They set to work in a "spirit independent and yet on the whole faithful, not punctilious and yet not wilfully capricious and erratic, content to tell their story very much as it came, sometimes in the words of their predecessors and sometimes in their own." [1]

(2) *External Conditions*—(*a*) *The Effect of the Use of MSS. Rolls.*—Many of the differences may be due to the fact that the MSS. took the form of rolls, which were often lengthy and cumbrous and not easy to

[1] Sanday, *O.S.S.P.* p. 15.

keep open at a particular place. The Evangelist would not have his copy continuously before him, but would consult it from time to time. He would not, therefore, follow it clause by clause and phrase by phrase, but would probably read through a whole paragraph at once, and trust to his memory to convey the substance of it safely from the one book to the other. This would give ample opportunities for looseness of reproduction, and would adequately account for many of the slight disarrangements and substitutions which are such a marked feature in the texts of the Gospels as we have them.

(*b*) *The Overlapping of Documents.*—Some of these phenomena may also be due to the fact that Luke and Matthew used both St. Mark and Q, and that in some cases the two documents overlapped.

(*c*) *Different Recensions of the Text of St. Mark.*—Sanday is of opinion that far the greater number of coincidences of St. Matthew and St. Luke against St. Mark are due to the use by the former of a recension of the text of the latter different from that from which all the extant MSS. of the Second Gospel are descended. Neither our present St. Mark, even in the best text, nor the copies used by Luke and Matthew, were exactly what Mark wrote. Sanday thinks it proved beyond doubt that none of the extant copies of St. Mark, not even those constructed on the highest critical principles, are absolutely identical with Mark's autograph, and that a few mistakes or modifications have crept in. This is true also of the copies used by Matthew and Luke which were not Mark's autograph, and into them too changes had been introduced and with considerable freedom.

I am inclined to think that on the whole Sanday's

solution is to be preferred to the theory which demands a somewhat elaborate literary procedure on the part of an early Christian writer, as is the case with Holdsworth's very suggestive hypothesis.

THE OMISSION BY LUKE OF ST. MARK VI. 45–VIII. 46.—The omission by the third Evangelist of a considerable section of the Second Gospel is a factor of such importance as to demand separate treatment. A common view is that this section has been omitted by Luke because it contained duplicates—a second feeding, a second storm at sea—as well as in part discourses (like those about eating with unwashed hands) which would not interest Luke's Gentile readers. It has, however, been pointed out [1] that the Evangelist has elsewhere no very strong prejudice against duplicates, as is proved by the inclusion in his Gospel of songs of Mary and Zacharias, Simeon and Anna, Levi and Zacchaeus, both converted publicans, the mission of the Twelve as well as that of the Seventy, two cleansings of lepers, Parables of a Lost Sheep and a Lost Coin, and that this explanation is, therefore, not quite satisfactory. Holdsworth,[2] Williams,[3] and Wright [4] explain this omission on the ground that this section was absent from the copy of St. Mark that Luke used. Hawkins [5] does not accept this explanation because there is no appreciable difference between this one-ninth part of our St. Mark and the remaining eight-ninths which must have been the case if this section had been a later addition to the original Gospel. If the addition was made by Mark himself there would, however, be no objection to it on this score. He suggests three possible ex-

[1] Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. xxviii.
[2] Holdsworth, *op. cit.* p. 155.
[3] See p. 199
[4] Wright, *op. cit.* p. lviii.
[5] *O.S.S.P.* pp. 63-73

planations of this phenomenon, giving the preference to the first of the three.

(1) This section of St. Mark was contained in Luke's copy of it, but was accidentally omitted by him, owing perhaps to his having been misled by passing on in his MS. from the mention of the feeding of the multitudes in Mark vi. 42-44 to the same phrase in viii. 19-21, or from the name Bethsaida in vi. 45 to the same name in viii. 22. He contends that the suggestion is considerably strengthened by the consideration of the physical difficulties that must have beset copyists in the first century, to which we have already referred earlier in the chapter.

(2) Luke may have passed over this section intentionally because its contents seemed to him unsuitable for his Gospel, or at least not so suitable for it as other materials which he already had for use. Holdsworth, on the other hand, contends that this section contains matter that would be peculiarly attractive to St. Luke, more particularly the story of the Syro-Phoenician Woman, and that it is unthinkable that St. Luke of all Evangelists should have chosen this passage for omission.

(3) The explanation may be found in a combination of the two hypotheses of accident and intention. Luke may just have missed this division of St. Mark by opening his MS. at the wrong place and then, even if he afterwards discovered his mistake and examined the omitted matter, it might seem to him that none of it was so necessary or even so suitable for his special purposes that he would care to go back and rectify the omission by any subsequent insertion.

Sanday [1] suggests that the section was omitted

[1] Sanday, *O.S.S.P.* p. 25.

from motives of space. The Gospels were written each on a separate roll of papyrus, and there was a sort of recognised convention as to the average length of each roll. St. Mark would take up about 19 ft. of an average sized roll, St. John 23½ ft., St. Matthew 30 ft., Acts and St. Luke about 31 or 32 ft., and these last figures are larger than those of any of the well-known existing MSS. Thus a book of the *Iliad* is only 25 ft., and of the *Odyssey* 24 ft. St. Luke may have, therefore, felt that he was pressed for space, and that as he had to omit something he left out the material that could be most easily dispensed with on other grounds.

Wendling's Theory of the Composition of St. Mark.—Before we close the discussion of the Marcan document a word must be said with reference to a theory held by some scholars that in the Second Gospel we have a composite document made up of different strata which were eventually combined into one whole. The best known example of the "composite theory" is that associated with the name of Wendling. Wendling sees in our Second Gospel three strata contributed by three different authors, M1, M2, and M3 or Ev. (Evangelist). M1 is primarily a "historian," and his work, which is the earliest stratum, shows manifest signs of derivation from a source in close proximity to the actual facts. M1 was worked over later by M2, a writer who in contrast with M, the historian, is a "poet." This was the form of the Gospel used by Luke. After the appearance of St. Luke and before the appearance of St. Matthew the document was again worked over by a third hand, M3 or Ev., who was a "theologian." The document thus completed was used in the compilation of our

First Gospel, and is practically identical with our present St. Mark. The theory is most fully explained and criticised by N. P. Williams in the *O.S.S.P.* pp. 389-421, to which the reader is referred for further information.

IV. The "Logian" Document or Q

A comparison of St. Matthew and St. Luke reveals the presence of a second common source composed mainly of sayings and discourses of Jesus in addition to the Marcan narrative we have been considering. This second source, in spite of many divergences of opinion as to its origin and character, is now by common consent designated by the letter Q (German *Quelle* = source). It is held by a large number of authorities that this document is identical with the Matthaean writing mentioned in the passage from Papias quoted by Eusebius[1]: "So then Matthew composed the Logia in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted them as he was able"; and that the First Gospel was attributed to Matthew because it embodied this Aramaic compilation of "Logia" with special thoroughness. Moffatt[2] writing in this connection remarks: "Matthew was too obscure an Apostle to be associated by later tradition with a Gospel unless there was some ground for it, and, as he cannot have written the canonical Gospel, the natural inference is that he was responsible for the primary logia-source which characterised it." In support of this hypothesis it should also be noted that the Q material in St. Matthew is introduced in five great blocks, each block closing with the words, "And it

[1] Eus. *H.E.* vol. iii. 39.

[2] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 194.

came to pass when Jesus ended these words," which gives some colour to the suggestion that we may have represented in these five blocks the very divisions of Papias' *Exposition*, which, according to Eusebius, was published in five books. As against this, however, we have Burkitt's [1] suggestion that the "Logia" of Matthew of which Papias speaks were a collection of "Messianic proof-texts" like the *testimonia* of Cyprian, while Armitage Robinson [2] definitely decides against their identification with Q. Harnack [3] only admits "a strong balance of probability that Q is the work of Matthew." The unanimity of scholars largely disappears when they leave the general position that a Q source does underlie St. Matthew and St. Luke, and when we come to consider details we find ourselves faced with a perfect medley of opinions as to the following points:

(1) Was Q a simple collection of discourses or sayings of Jesus, or did it contain narrative as well?

(2) Which of the two Gospels has preserved Q with the greater accuracy?

(3) Did Matthew and Luke use the same version of Q?

(4) Did it contain a narrative of the Passion?

(5) Was Mark acquainted with it and did he make use of it?

We propose to deal with each of these questions in order.

(1) *Reconstructions of Q.*—The attempt to reconstruct Q has been a popular pastime among New Testament scholars during the last twenty years. Moffatt [4] gives an analysis of sixteen of these efforts,

[1] Burkitt, *op. cit.* p. 127.
[2] Armitage Robinson, *Study of the Gospels*, pp. 69-70.
[3] Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, p. 26. [4] Moffatt, *op. cit.* pp. 197-207.

associated with the names of Harnack, Stanton, Allen, Holtzmann, Hawkins, and J. Weiss, among others, of which Harnack's [1] is perhaps the best known. The majority of these schemes are drawn up on the principle of including in them all material common to St. Matthew and St. Luke which is not contained in the Marcan narrative. The result of this is that we get a document which consists mainly of discourses and sayings, but which also includes a certain amount of narrative, such as the record of the Baptist's teaching, the stories of our Lord's Baptism and Temptation, the account of the healing of the Centurion's servant and of the Baptist's embassy from prison, but which does not contain the Passion story.

The inclusion of narrative in a collection of "Sayings of Jesus" has called forth a vigorous protest from Archdeacon Allen and Mr. Holdsworth. The former in an essay in the *O.S.S.P.*[2] contends that Q as generally described by the majority of scholars, containing an account of a miracle and only four parables, is utterly inconsistent with the impression we derive of the character of this document from early tradition. If it contained parables they would not be confined to this particular four, and it is quite unthinkable that the account of a miracle should be included in it. He, therefore, reconstructs the source used by the first Evangelist, not on the method adopted by Harnack of throwing into it passages common to St. Matthew and St. Luke, but on the principle that the sayings of Jesus, over and above those already found in St. Mark, when put together present us with a homogeneous, consistent, and

[1] Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus.* [2] Allen, *O.S.S.P.* pp. 235-281.

intelligible work. He claims that the collection of discourses and sayings formed on this principle gives us a document which was manifestly compiled to represent certain aspects of Christ's teaching, and that it is marked by very characteristic phraseology. Allen differs also from the majority of scholars in that he confines the use of his Q source to the First Gospel. He maintains that the differences *e.g.* between the versions of the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer found in the First and Third Gospels respectively lead irresistibly to the conclusion that the two writers are not arbitrarily altering words which they had before them in the same form, but are reproducing separate traditions of our Lord's words. His Logia-document, therefore, contains much that is not found in St. Luke at all, as *e.g.* the cluster of parables in St. Matt. xiii. 24-33, 36-52, the Tares, the Mustard Seed, the Leaven, the Hid Treasure, the Goodly Pearl, and the Draw-Net.

Allen is of opinion that this book of sources is hardly likely to have been seen by Luke, although he has in his Gospel much that ultimately came from it. This material, however, he probably derived from it indirectly through one or more of the Gospel writings with which he professes acquaintance, which had already borrowed from this Logian document.

Holdsworth [1] also protests just as strenuously as Allen against the inclusion of narrative in Q. The incidents generally associated with Q are by him, as we have seen, placed in the early copies of St. Mark. He also draws a distinction between sayings of our Lord made in the course of His common intercourse with men and those which He uttered when dealing

[1] Holdsworth, *op. cit.* pp. 51 f.

with great underlying principles of life and godliness. The sayings in Q, according to him, belong to the second of these categories, and resemble in form and structure those which are found scattered in the New Testament Epistles, in extra-canonical writings, and more especially the collection of "Sayings of Jesus" discovered at Oxyrhynchus, all of which are independent of any historical setting and are unconnected with any narrative. St. Matthew had before him one of the many loose and informal collections of sayings of which the Oxyrhynchus papyrus is a type, and he distributed the sayings which he could accept as genuine under different heads, and this σύνταξις was then sandwiched into the First Gospel between blocks of Marcan narrative. This procedure, according to Mr. Holdsworth, accounts for both the statement of Papias and the association of Matthew's name with the Gospel.

Many scholars besides Allen include in Q several passages which are not found in both the First and Third Gospels, and which at first sight do not seem to belong to the common Logian tradition. Thus Streeter [1] suggests that Luke ix. 5–xv. 10 (the great interpolation) is in the main an extract from Q, while Hawkins [2] would include in it Matt. v. 17-48 (Christ's interpretation of the Old Law).

I shall not attempt to express any opinion as to the real character and contents of this Logian source. The time has hardly arrived perhaps to pronounce definitely for any particular type of reconstruction, and it will be well to wait for further light and discussion before coming to any decided conclusion.

(2) *Which of the Gospels, St. Matthew and St. Luke,*

[1] Streeter, *O.S.S.P.* pp. 189-208. [2] Hawkins, *O.S.S.P.* p. 132.

has preserved Q with the Greater Degree of Accuracy?— We note a striking difference between the methods adopted by the two Evangelists in their distribution of the Q material. Matthew has arranged his material in five sections, according to the subject, while Luke has preferred to place his matter in a chronological setting. In his case the sections are interpolated among the Marcan and other material in such a way as to give the impression that they were spoken on certain definite occasions specified by the Evangelist. The most characteristic illustration of this difference of method is found in the case of the Sermon on the Mount where Matthew has gathered together sayings of our Lord which in St. Luke are scattered over chaps. vi., xi., xii., xiii., and xvi. Again, in the charge to the Twelve, Matthew has combined into one homogeneous whole material which is distributed by Luke in chaps. vi., xii., xiv., xvi., xvii., as well as some matter derived from St. Mark xiii.

It becomes, therefore, a pertinent question which of the two Evangelists has best preserved the order of the original Q. Most of our authorities pronounce in favour of Luke. Harnack stands almost alone in defending the order in St. Matthew. It is argued that no good reason can be given why Luke, if he had found the different sections of the Q material placed as they are in St Matthew, should have changed their positions to those which they occupy in his own Gospel, whereas the reverse process on the part of Matthew is quite intelligible.[1] A well defined principle seems to run through the arrangement of the Q material in St. Matthew. The Evangelist has brought together all the passages which he found scattered in

[1] Stanton, *op. cit.* p. 76.

his source and ranged them according to their different subjects. Thus all that is most striking in our Lord's teaching on general Christian ethics is found collected and combined in chaps. v.-vii. and his teaching on the Church's Mission is, in the same way, centralised in chap. x.

Again a careful study of Matthew's and Luke's treatment of St. Mark points in the same direction. Matthew has freely altered his original source here, while Luke follows Mark's order much more closely. It is probable, therefore, that the latter has preserved the order of his second basal source with greater accuracy. It has been suggested that Matthew's elaborate rearrangement of his sources was due to the fact that he had employed his material already for catechetical purposes, and that he had been a catechist before he became an Evangelist.[1]

Allen's theory of the character and contents of Q, to which we have already referred, confines its use to the First Gospel, and necessitates a different "Logia" source for St. Luke, so that the question of preference does not arise in this case.

(3) *Did Matthew and Luke use the same Version of Q?*—Here the issue seems to be confined to the question whether the differences between the Q material in the two Gospels is to be explained on the theory that Matthew and Luke employed different translations of the one original Aramaic document, or whether we are to postulate two different collections of "Sayings" bearing a somewhat close relation to each other, the one used by Matthew and the second by Luke. Stanton and Moffatt decide in favour of the former alternative, while Allen, as we have already

[1] Streeter, *O.S.S.P.* p. 155.

seen, demands a separate collection of " Sayings " for St. Luke, and in this matter is supported by Holdsworth.

Those who hold the first view contend that the correspondences between the Q material in the two Gospels are explained by the use of a common source, while the differences are due to conditions affecting the translation into Greek of an Aramaic document.

The second alternative has to contend with the difficulty of explaining the remarkably close resemblance in substance and phraseology between the Q material in either Gospel if it was derived from independent collections of " Sayings." Holdsworth maintains, however, that the character of the " Sayings," their epigrammatic form, and the reverence with which such utterances were held completely account for the fact that some " Sayings " appear in the one collection in a form all but identical with that in which they appear in the other. On the other hand he holds that the differences are too great to be explained merely on the score of translation. He reproduces Allen's argument in regard to the different versions of the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer in support of this contention, and argues that least of all in this section would Luke feel himself at liberty to amend the form in which he found the " Sayings." On the whole perhaps the balance of probabilities is in favour of the first alternative, which means that the differences between the versions of the Q material in the two Gospels are due to the exigencies of translation of the same document, although the question of editorial temperament must not be left out of sight.

(4) *Did Q contain a Passion Narrative?*—There are two scholars of repute who include a story of the

Passion in Q, viz. Burkitt and Vernon Bartlet. The former writing in the *Journal of Theological Studies* remarks: "I find it difficult to believe that critical method is wholly to be trusted which presents us with a document that starts off with a story of our Lord's Baptism and then gives us His words but not the story of the Cross and Resurrection." He also writes in another place: "The Parable of the Sheep and the Goats in Matt. xxv. 31-46 makes so dramatic a conclusion of our Lord's discourses that we might regard it as the actual peroration of Q. The Passion narrative of St. Matthew is evidently derived from St. Mark, but Luke's account of the Passion is different, and seems to show that Q might have contained the Passion story. Luke's account of the scenes previous to the trial, etc., is more intelligible than Mark's, and suggests that he was following a very valuable source." [1]

Vernon Bartlet [2] is also of opinion that Q "in some form included the Passion story, so full of sayings bearing on Jesus the Messiah and His Mission," and that this is largely reproduced by Luke. The bulk of opinion is, however, opposed to this conclusion.

Stanton,[3] replying to the argument that a document which included a record of the Baptist's preaching and of our Lord's Baptism and Temptation must *a fortiori* have contained a narrative of the Passion, justifies the inclusion of the former incidents on the ground that a setting more or less historical would be naturally given to Christ's teaching where it was possible. Furthermore, these particular incidents were specially suited to form an introduction to a book

[1] Burkitt, *op. cit.* chap. iv. [2] Bartlet, *O.S.S.P.* p. 335.
[3] Stanton, *op. cit.* p. 105 n.

which was principally concerned with the discourses of our Lord. The Baptism and Temptation are closely associated with the preaching of John, which is the true starting-point and the fitting prelude to the teaching of Jesus. Again, if Q contained the narrative of these incidents at the beginning and ended with the story of the Passion, it is difficult to understand why it should not have included a brief account of the Ministry and thus have formed a complete Gospel, a position which no one seems to advocate.

The fact that Matthew makes no use of Luke's account of the Passion, which is so much richer in detail than Mark's which he does use, is a very serious objection to the theory that the former narrative was derived from Q. Streeter [1] suggests that the version of Q which reached Luke had already been expanded to include the Passion story.

Hawkins [2] has a very suggestive theory as to the origin of Luke's Passion narrative. He explains the allusion in Philemon *v.* 24 to Luke as a "fellow-worker" of St. Paul as implying that the Evangelist was, like the Apostle himself, a preacher of the Gospel, and would, therefore, before he wrote his Gospel have been accustomed to make oral use of the materials which he embodied in this part of his document. A similar suggestion, it will be remembered, is made with regard to the first Evangelist's arrangement of Q.[3] In this portion of St. Luke we, therefore, have to some extent a reproduction of the Pauline preaching which, in contrast with the Synoptic tradition as a whole, was mainly concerned with the

[1] Streeter, *O.S.S.P.* p. 203. [2] Hawkins, *O.S.S.P.* pp. 76-94.
[3] See p. 213.

Crucifixion and Resurrection so far as it consisted in setting forth facts. The Evangelist had as a preacher gradually supplemented and modified and transposed the current Marcan narrative as far as it related to the Passion and Crucifixion for homiletic purposes, and when he came to this section of the Gospel he would write down the memories of his former preaching without directly referring to his usual Marcan source. Hawkins adduces two arguments in support of his theory:

(*a*) Luke's Passion narrative commences with the Institution of the Eucharist, an incident recorded by Paul himself and the one solitary exception to his silence as to any acts of Jesus preceding the actual Passion.

(*b*) The new material included by Luke in this section was such as would prove attractive and interesting when used in preaching, including as it does the warning to Simon Peter, the address to the women of Jerusalem, and the story of the penitent thief.

This suggestion of Hawkins does not, however, commend itself to Sanday,[1] who points out that the features added by Luke are all historical details, for the most part of secondary importance. They are included as narrative for narrative's sake and not for the sake of doctrine, and are, therefore, unlikely to have occupied a very prominent position in the Apostolic preaching, as Hawkins suggests they did.

(5) *Was Mark acquainted with Q and did he make use of it in his Gospel?*—Finally there is the question whether Mark knew Q and used it. Moffatt[2] decides against the hypothesis of a literary dependence of

[1] Sanday, *O.S.S.P.* pp. xiii., xiv. [2] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 205.

Mark upon Q on three grounds: (*a*) It implies that Q had a monopoly of the "Sayings of Jesus." (*b*) It is not satisfactorily explained why Mark, if he knew Q, made such a restricted use of it. (*c*) The origin of passages in Mark which are sometimes ascribed to Q is more easily explained on other grounds. They may, *e.g.*, be echoes of oral tradition embodied by the second Evangelist.

Streeter [1] considers that it is established beyond doubt that Mark was familiar with Q and that he quoted it occasionally but probably only from memory.

He points out that there are several places, as *e.g.* the Baptist's preaching, the story of the Temptation, the Beelzebub controversy, the Parable of the Mustard Seed, and the Mission charge where all three Gospels agree in substance but where there are several variations and additions in which Matthew and Luke agree against Mark. These are of so striking a character that they must have derived their versions in part, if not wholly, from some other source than St. Mark. He explains this phenomenon by the hypothesis that different versions of these particular passages were found in both Q and St. Mark. A close examination of these passages also makes it clear, in his opinion, that here Mark and Q are not following independent lines of tradition but that Mark had knowledge of and makes use of Q. The method of quotation, which is somewhat inexact, suggests the use of memory rather than the transcription of a document actually before the author.

B. Weiss [2] goes somewhat further in this direction than Streeter in postulating on the part of Mark the

[1] Streeter, *O.S.S.P.* pp. 166-183.

[2] B. Weiss, *Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 246 ff.—E.T.

use of the actual document employed by Matthew and Luke, but only to a limited extent. Wellhausen,[1] on the other hand, assumes a literary relation between St. Mark and Q, but reverses the process and urges the dependence of Q upon Mark. Stanton[2] has a theory all his own on this point, and dismisses alike the view that various pieces of Christ's teaching given in St. Mark were taken by him from the Greek "Logian" document and the inverse view advocated by Wellhausen. He explains the scarcity in St. Mark of long continuous discourses as compared with St. Matthew and St. Luke, as well as the form which Christ's teaching takes in the Second Gospel, as giving an illustration of a certain stage in the process of the transmission of the teaching of Jesus to the Greek-speaking world. Mark had not the longer pieces readily at his command, because a full translation into Greek did not yet exist.

V. Luke's Special Sources

We now approach a very difficult aspect of the Synoptic problem, viz. the discussion of St. Luke's special sources.

The following sections are in the main peculiar to the Third Gospel:

(1) The narrative of the birth and childhood of John the Baptist and of Jesus, and the genealogy of Jesus (chaps. i., ii., iii. 23-38).

(2) The Travel document (chaps. ix. 51–xviii. 14).

(3) The Passion narrative, and more especially the post-Resurrection appearances in chaps. xxiii. 54–xxiv. 53.

[1] Wellhausen, *Einl. in die drei ersten Evangelien*, pp. 73 ff.

[2] Stanton, *op. cit.* pp. 112-114.

The normal " two document " theory bases Luke's Gospel on a form of St. Mark, a Greek " Logian " document, both of which it has in common with St. Matthew, and an additional source or sources from which the peculiar matter contained in it is derived. A variant of the prevailing theory has lately been gaining ground which reduces the Lucan sources to two, viz. a form of St. Mark, and a second document in which the Lucan form of Q (QL) and Luke's special material had already been combined. This suggestion was made as long ago as 1891 by Feine,[1] and in its main aspect is now adopted by Stanton[2] and Vernon Bartlet.[3]

Stanton describes Luke's second principal source as an expanded form of Q. The material added to Q in this second source was embodied somewhere in Palestine. It is Jewish-Christian in origin, Hebraistic in style, and came before the Evangelist in writing, with the exception of some passages gathered from Aramaic tradition which were added by him. Among these were certain incidents in the Passion narrative and the post-Resurrection appearances of Christ.

Bartlet agrees with Stanton as to the composition and homogeneity of Luke's second source and also as to its Hebraistic style, which is not confined to the Nativity section, but is equally discernible in the " Travel document " and the Resurrection story. He differs from him and from the majority of scholars in demanding that Q first appeared in writing in Luke's second source, and that it must have come to the first Evangelist in the form of oral tradition. Harnack, Streeter, Bartlet and Hawkins all suggest

[1] Feine, *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas.*
[2] Stanton, *op. cit.* p. 239. [3] Bartlet, *O.S.S.P.* p. 350.

that Luke collected his material at Caesarea, where he stayed as St. Paul's companion during the latter's two years' imprisonment in that city, and that his chief informants were probably Philip the Evangelist and his four daughters.

Sanday [1] dissents strongly from Stanton's and Bartlet's view that Q was already embodied in Luke's special source, and argues that Q must have come before the Evangelist in a separate form. Some of the phenomena in the Gospel, he says, can only be explained on the ground of the overlapping of Q and his special material, and this would not be possible if the two sources had already been fused before they came into Luke's hands.

Holdsworth [2] propounds a very suggestive origin for the peculiar narrative material in the Third Gospel. He traces in the "Travel document," which includes a very full account of the last journey to Jerusalem and is our sole authority for the incomparable teaching we derive from the parables of the Good Samaritan, the Rich Man and Lazarus, and the Prodigal Son, a strong Samaritan element, an intimate acquaintance with the court of Herod, and a powerful sympathy with women. It also bears manifest signs of the eye-witness in the description of the journey. Holdsworth, therefore, suggests that the "Travel document" came from one of the little band of women who accompanied and ministered to our Lord on that memorable journey. Three women are named in this connection, Mary Magdalene, Susanna, and Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and his choice falls upon Joanna.

She is mentioned by name in this Gospel only,

[1] Sanday, *O.S.S.P.* p. xxii. [2] Holdsworth, *op. cit.* pp. 162-171.

and she satisfies the conditions of the problem. The womanly element sometimes ascribed to the daughters of Philip, the Samaritan element ascribed to Philip himself, and the knowledge of Herodian affairs are all emphasised in the single person of Joanna, who was a woman, associated with the court of Herod, and had to do with the Samaritans. It seems that this suggestion of Mr. Holdsworth's, although arrived at by him quite independently, is not quite original, as it had been already put forward by Sanday.[1] What suggestion is there indeed which does not owe something to Dr. Sanday's initiative! Holdsworth is also of opinion that the remaining sections peculiar to St. Luke, viz. the Nativity section and that which records our Lord's post-Resurrection appearances, may be traced to the same source. The first three chapters belong neither to St. Mark nor to Q, and would seem to have been based on a Judaean rather than a Galilean source, and the feminine element is also very prominent here. In the narrative of the post-Resurrection appearances Joanna's name is again mentioned.[2] Holdsworth, therefore, concludes that in the Third Gospel we have, in addition to the Marcan narrative and a collection of our Lord's "Sayings," a third and special Lucan source, a document containing the Nativity, "Travel document," and details of the Passion and Resurrection, which is the work of Joanna, who was connected through her husband both with Herod and the Samaritans, had relations with the mother of Jesus, and was possessed of strong womanly sympathy.

[1] See Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. ii. p. 639.
[2] St. Luke xxiv. 10.

VI. The Literary Evolution of the Gospels

This chapter would not be complete without some reference to Mr. Streeter's illuminating essay on this subject in the *O.S.S.P.*[1] Considerations of space will only allow me to insert a very brief summary of his conclusions.

Mr. Streeter's main position is that the Logian document Q, St. Mark's Gospel, and the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke form three distinct stages in the evolution of the Gospel writings. Q belongs to the Apostolic age, St. Mark forms the stage of transition, and the two later Gospels belong clearly to the sub-Apostolic period.

Q and St. Mark by their very incompleteness, the one containing no mention of the Crucifixion and the other giving such scanty fragments of the Master's teaching, indicate an age which almost daily "expected the Lord's return and needed not to collect or complete for a posterity which would never be born, an age when the witnesses were so many and the tradition so vivid that it was impossible to think of being exhaustive, and he who wrote, wrote only a selection for a special purpose, an age when to put 'the Gospel' in writing meant to compose, not a biography of the Master, but an epitome of His Message."

Q was a selection compiled for the use of the primitive Christian missionary, and consisted of those deeds or words of the Master which would guide him in dealing with the problems of his day and explained such questions as the relation of Christ's teaching to that of the Baptist, its relation to the

[1] Streeter, *op. cit.* pp. 210-227.

Pharisaic doctrine, and how the crucified prophet could be indeed the Christ, the Messiah. It is, therefore, perfectly intelligible as a document written to supplement the living tradition of a generation which had known Christ and produced in the non-literary society of Palestinian peasants to preserve *only what they would be likely to forget.*

St. Mark is in sharp contrast to Q both in its purpose and in the environment it presupposes. The place of composition is no longer in Palestine but in Rome, where the general public had never heard of Jesus, " where the title Christ—in Palestine thrilling with all the magic of a nation's immemorial hope—is to many hardly more than the bizarre conception of a disliked and incomprehensible Oriental tribe . . . and where lastly we have *a reading public.*" Here something like a biography would be wanted, showing who He was and how He manifested His powers, how He had died, and how it was known He had risen again. Mark, therefore, seeks to prove to the Gentiles that Jesus is the " Son of God." Miracles of healing abound in the story and the Passion is given in detail. We trace in Mark's Gospel also the result of the greater distance from the events than Q, both in time and space. We are far away from the land where the career of the Nazarene had been a nine days' wonder, discussed in every village. The Pauline influence is also seen at work in the Gospel. The author of Q was glad not to dwell too much on the Crucifixion, which in Palestine was still a paradox and a stumbling-block, but to Paul, and through him to Mark, " Christ crucified " was the very centre of the Christian religion. The omission of so much teaching from St. Mark is not, however, to be attributed to

lack of interest in it, but to the fact that Rome was probably already in possession of Q. Thus Q was written to supplement, and not to supersede, a living tradition, and St. Mark was written to supplement, and not to supersede, Q or some deposit of material very like Q.

Matthew and Luke are more ambitious and aim at completeness, beginning with the birth of the Saviour and including in one volume His teaching and His life. They do not merely supplement but supersede previous works. Q is an unordered collection of sayings and incidents, St. Mark is a collection of vignettes—scenes from the life of the Master—but Matthew's aim is to give in one convenient volume a complete account of our Lord's life, a systematic view of His teaching, and a conclusive proof of His Messiahship. Luke again wrote in an atmosphere far different from Matthew's. He was not writing for men to whom "Messiah" is a magic word—whose religion has always been presented as Law. "He is, moreover, a consummate literary artist. He is writing a biography avowedly inspired, like a biography by a Tacitus or a Plutarch, with that feeling of *pietas* towards its subject, which antiquity praised in an historian, but which modern scholars with difficulty condone. The artist starts with a definite conception of that which he is to depict; he selects, he arranges; above all he ruthlessly discards."

Luke's main conception is Jesus, not primarily the Messiah of Israel, but the Saviour, the Healer of soul and body for all the world. Comfort and help to the poor, to the sick, to the impotent, to the Samaritan, to the Gentile—that is for him the Gospel.

The superiority of St. Matthew and St. Luke to

St. Mark is that of a portrait by Rembrandt to a mechanical snapshot. "The presence of a great man, the magic of his voice, the march of his argument, have a mesmeric influence on those who hear which is lost in the bare transcript of fragmentary sayings and isolated acts such as we find in Q and in St. Mark. Later on two great, though perhaps unconscious, artists, trained in the movement begun by the Master and saturated by His Spirit, retell the tale, idealising—if you will—the picture, but in so doing make us to realise something of the majesty and tenderness which once men knew in Galilee."

It only remains to add that Mr. Streeter most appositely illustrates this sketch of the evolution of the Gospel writings by the analogy of the similar process in connection with the successive lives of Francis of Assisi.

CHAPTER II

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

LITERATURE FOR CHAPTER II.

Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire.* 1897.
St. Paul the Traveller. 1896.
Historical Commentary on Galatians. 1899.
Pauline Studies. 1906.
The Cities of St. Paul. 1907.
Expositor, vii. 7 and viii. 5.
Harnack, *Luke the Physician.* 1907. E.T.
The Acts of the Apostles. 1909. E.T.
The Date of Acts and Synoptic Gospels. 1911. E.T.
Chase, *The Credibility of the Acts.* 1902.
G. Resch, "Das Apostoldekret nach seiner ausserkanonischen Textgestalt" (*T. und U.*, N.F. xiii. 3, 1905).
Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles.* 1906.
K. Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul.* 1910.
Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents.* Part II. 1909.
Maurice Jones, *St. Paul the Orator.* 1910.
Knowling, *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ.* 1911.
Articles on "Acts" and "St. Paul" in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* and in *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*

THERE is no book in the whole of the New Testament whose position in the critical world has been so enhanced by recent research as the Acts of the Apostles. It is less than fifty years ago since the book could be described by a great German scholar as a document, "the statements of which can only be looked upon as intentional deviations from historical truth in the interest of the special tendency which they possess." [1] A type of criticism which relegates

[1] Baur, *Paul,* vol. i. p. 108.

the Acts to the second century and regards it as a patchwork compilation of sources of little historical value, edited by an unknown and unskilful writer, who was either utterly unable to distinguish truth from fiction or deliberately falsified the truth in the interest of certain theories, is still undoubtedly prevalent among Continental scholars. Thus Weizsäcker writes in 1902: "The historical value of the narrative in Acts shrinks until it reaches a vanishing point," [1] while Schmiedel sums up his impressions of the book as a historical document in the following terms: "There is no way of acquitting the writer of the Acts from the charge of having moulded history under the influence of 'tendency.'" "Apart from the 'we'-sections no statement needs immediate acceptance on the mere ground of its presence in the book." [2]

But there are unmistakable signs that critical thought is rapidly moving away from this position, and although scholars as a body may not yet be prepared to endorse in every particular Ramsay's appreciation of the Acts as "the work of a historian of first rank, who commands excellent means of knowledge, either through personal acquaintance or through access to original documents, and who brings to his treatment of his subject genius, literary style, and historical insight into human character and movement of events," [3] there is no denying the fact that the book is gaining ground in public esteem and establishing for itself a place of high rank as a historical document, written by a companion of St. Paul who was also the writer of the Third Gospel. It is a significant

[1] Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, p. 106 f.
[2] Schmiedel, *Ency. Bibl.*, vol. iii. pp. 43, 46.
[3] Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 2 f.

illustration of the prevailing tendency that Dr. Moffatt, whom one could in no way describe as conservative in character or method, unreservedly accepts this hypothesis.[1]

The marked advance in the critical estimate of Acts is due mainly to the labours of three scholars, Sir W. M. Ramsay, Sir John Hawkins, and Dr. Harnack.

Ramsay has for more than twenty-five years spent a considerable portion of his time in Asia Minor investigating, exploring, and studying the antiquities of the district upon the spot. He has thus rendered services which are perfectly invaluable to the historian of early Christianity. He has followed the great Apostle of the Gentiles through every stage of his momentous Missionary career, and has thrown a perfect flood of light upon a phase of Christian history and expansion which was shrouded in darkness owing to the lack of clear and definite knowledge of local conditions. The main results of his researches, which have been published in a continuous series of volumes beginning with the *Historical Geography of Asia Minor* in 1890, have been to establish the fact that the historical and political conditions depicted in Acts are emphatically those of the first and not of the second century of the Christian era, a conclusion which has a most important bearing upon the questions of the authorship and date of the book. The changes in political geography and in provincial nomenclature in the period between A.D. 70 and 150 were so momentous and so rapid that it was a practical impossibility for a second century writer to display the accurate knowledge of first century conditions

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 295.

which we find in Acts. There was a constant interchange of provinces between Emperor and Senate. Thus Achaia was subjected to four changes of this character between the year A.D. 15 and the close of the first century, and yet the author of the Acts is absolutely correct when he describes Gallio as proconsul of Corinth in A.D. 52. He displays the same accuracy when he speaks of praetors and lictors at Philippi, of a proconsul at Cyprus, and his description of the supreme board of magistrates at Thessalonica by the curious and rare title " politarchs " is proved to be correct by inscriptions which have been discovered within recent years.

The author's knowledge of local social conditions is also seen to be on the same high level of accuracy, and a striking illustration of this is provided in his picture of the position of women in Asia Minor and Macedonia.

Acts as a whole then is the work of a writer who in the " we "-sections is describing his own personal experiences and in the remainder of the book is utilising trustworthy sources, and who everywhere follows with minute care the best authority accessible to him.

Hawkins and Harnack working on entirely different lines have both practically arrived at the same conclusion as Ramsay. The former in his *Horae Synopticae* and the latter in his *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das N.T.*, three volumes of which dealing with this subject have been translated into English under the titles *Luke the Physician*, *The Acts of the Apostles*, and *The Date of Acts and the Synoptic Gospels*, have subjected the Lucan writings to an exhaustive linguistic analysis, and have proved to the satisfaction of all

who approach the subject, free from prepossessions, that the author of the diary in the later chapters of Acts is one with the author of the whole book and of the Third Gospel. This author of Acts and the Third Gospel is to be identified with St. Luke the companion, friend, and physician of St. Paul.

Harnack in his introduction to the second of the three volumes mentioned above shows a remarkable insight into the character, purpose, and spirit of the Acts, and his high appreciation of the book in all its phases cannot fail to influence profoundly its position in public esteem for many a year to come. He emphasises the manifold proofs that the book contains of being the work of one who was in direct contact with the facts he records, and whose Hellenic training and spirit can be detected in his sense for form, arrangement, and the art of right selection. Nothing is more striking in this introduction than Harnack's description of the aim of the writer of Acts, which was to show how the power of the Spirit of Jesus in the Apostles founded the primitive Christian community, called into being the Mission to the Gentiles, conducted the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome, and set the Gentile world in the place of the Jewish nation which hardened its heart more and more against the appeal of Christianity. In this connection he very rightly lays stress upon the combination of St. Peter and St. Paul in this record of Apostolic Christianity. This combination, which in the memory of the Church occupies the highest place of honour after the Founder himself, was not created by St. Luke but by history, and yet it would not have impressed itself so firmly and exclusively upon the mind of posterity without the Acts of the

Apostles. He also pays a very generous tribute to the impartiality of St. Luke who, while giving a trustworthy and honest account of the attitude of the Jewish nation as a whole, is careful to record all that might be said on its behalf. He points out that Jewish priests were to be found among the first converts, and emphasises all that was praiseworthy in the Pharisees, the prudent counsel of Gamaliel, and their comparatively favourable treatment of St. Paul.

Harnack does full justice to St. Luke's breadth of view as manifested in Acts, whose main purpose is to trace the progress of the Gospel across the world from Jerusalem to Rome, to the stylistic unity of the book, and to its high place in the ranks of literary achievements. At the same time he is not blind to what he considers the weaknesses of the author, his credulity in the matter of miraculous healing and "spiritual" gifts, a tendency to carelessness and inaccuracy often of a far-reaching character, and a fondness for working up important situations. This introduction, which is a veritable *tour de force*, should be read in its entirety if it is to be properly appreciated. In the body of this volume Harnack supplements his investigations into the linguistic phenomena of Acts by a similar enquiry regarding its trustworthiness in the matter of chronology, persons, lands, cities, and nations, and pronounces judgment upon the work in this respect in the following terms[1]: "The geographical and chronological references and notices in the book show the circumspection, the care, the consistency, and the trustworthiness of the writer." As a chronological document it is a very respectable work and holds its own very well when compared

[1] Harnack, *op. cit.* p. 112.

with the historical works of the period. That in point of chronology it leaves much to be desired is a fact so obvious as to require no express statement, but it is only a proof that the author, though he generally shows such interest in the times of duration of journeys and visits, did not wish to say more than he could vouch for, and has, therefore, kept silence on these points in this part of his work. The narrative as a whole is, both in accordance with the purpose of the writer and in reality, a genuinely historical work.[1]

Before we proceed further it may be desirable to draw attention to a very suggestive hypothesis with regard to the nationality of St. Luke. The hypothesis is all the more interesting as coming from a lady, Miss F. M. Stawell, who put it forward in a paper on "St. Luke and Virgil" at the International Medical Congress held at Oxford in 1913. Miss Stawell is of opinion that Luke was a Roman, and that his Roman origin gives the key to his whole work. She bases her conclusion largely on St. Luke's literary style. In his medical language he is naturally dependent on Greek medical writings, but when he is composing freely and independently his style is either modelled on Latin or on the Greek of the Septuagint. It did not follow that because Luke was versed in medicine he must of necessity have been a Greek. Some of the greatest medical authorities of the day were Romans, like Celsus, the famous Latin medical writer who flourished about 50 A.D. The name Luke is not Greek, but Roman, a surname in the *gens Annaea* to which Seneca, Gallio, and Lucan all belonged, and if he was a cadet of that great house it would explain why he was left at liberty in Rome when his friend

[1] Harnack. *op. cit.* pp. 29-30.

St. Paul was in prison, why he knew so much about Gallio's temperament, and how Seneca's writings show so strong a Christian character. Philippi, where Luke appears to have been stationed, was moreover a Roman colony. The Roman descent of St. Luke would also explain his evident sympathy with Rome, his desire to put her in the best light, his pride in his Roman citizenship and in the great name of Caesar, and perhaps his tone of disparagement when he speaks of Athens. His Roman sympathy also comes out in what Harnack describes as the real theme of Acts, the progress of the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome which was to be the centre of Christendom. Miss Stawell closes her paper with a description of the striking analogy between the conceptions of St. Luke and those of Virgil as exhibited in the *Aeneid*. The hero of that great poem is an instrument chosen by Divine power to accomplish the bringing of the gods to Italy after the destruction of Troy, his native city. So Paul in Acts is pressed to leave Palestine and to carry the Gospel to the great Roman world. In the *Aeneid* and in the Acts all through the wanderings we have mysterious signs signalling every step. As in the *Aeneid* so in Acts the effect of all the wanderings on sea and land is given by concentrating on one perilous voyage and describing it in detail. Luke with Virgil's example before him felt the details to be momentous in their symbolism. It is to the same influence that we are to trace the retention of the first person plural in the narrative, the " we " that has been so often discussed. Homer, Virgil, and St. Luke form a series of three who knew that in an epic of adventure and wandering the personal note is invaluable.

I must remain content with simply drawing attention to the suggestion, which is, to say the least of it, both instructive and picturesque.

Sources of Acts.—Much labour has been recently bestowed by scholars upon the question of the possible original sources of Acts, and various attempts have been made to continue in the case of this book the process which has been applied with so much success to the Synoptic Gospels. Here, however, the results are far less definite, and in no single case can the analysis be pronounced to be convincing. Scholars differ at the very outset as to whether the author of Acts had any written documents at his disposal at all, with the exception of the journal in the "we"-sections, which is generally agreed to have existed in some MS. form, although it was possibly edited and amplified afterwards.

Zahn [1] argues strongly against any attempt to distinguish different written sources in Acts beyond the Apostolic Decree in chap. xv. and the letter of Lysias in chap. xxiii. 26-30, while Harnack and Ramsay are very sparing in their advocacy of written documents. Milligan [2] and Moffatt [3] pronounce more decidedly in favour of written sources, and the latter holds that the gaps, roughnesses, discrepancies, and repetitions are only intelligible upon some such supposition as this. Both writers, however, allow room for the considerable influence of oral tradition in the composition of the book. There is some disposition to accept Blass's suggestion [4] that in the first or more Jewish half of the book St. Luke made use of a second

[1] Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. iii. p. 129.
[2] Milligan, *New Testament Documents*, pp. 162-164.
[3] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 286.
[4] Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 141 f., 193.

work of John Mark, written as a sequel to his Gospel in order to describe the actions of the Risen Christ and the founding of the Christian Church by the Apostles. There is again a remarkable difference of opinion on the question of Luke's dependence upon St. Paul's Epistles. The great majority of scholars decide definitely against any such dependence, and find in this hypothesis a strong argument for the comparatively early date of Acts. Thus Zahn [1] argues that the relation of Acts to the Epistles proves that the author was so close to the Apostle and had been associated with him so long that it was not necessary for him to study his letters in order to enlarge his own knowledge of the history. Ramsay,[2] however, urges that St. Luke had an obvious acquaintance with the Epistles, and that it is only this that explains many features in Acts which are difficult to account for otherwise, such as the complete absence in Acts of so much that is recorded in the letters. Luke assumes that all this is already known to his readers and that there is, therefore, no need for repetition on his part. All that is required of him is to set it in a clearer light.

Weizsäcker [3] again is equally insistent upon the indebtedness of Acts to the Pauline Epistles, but for entirely different reasons. He maintains that in that section of the book which is parallel to Galatians i., ii., the author is entirely dependent for his facts upon St. Paul's account in that Epistle, and that all that is of any real value in these particular chapters of Acts may be traced to the Epistle to the Galatians. I am of opinion, however, that the phenomena point

[1] Zahn, *op. cit.* p. 125. [2] Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 385.
[3] Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, p. 209.

clearly to the former alternative, that St. Luke in Acts, whether he was acquainted with the Epistles or not, has made very little, if any, use of them.

Although it may not be possible to arrive at a definite decision as to the extent to which St. Luke may have been dependent upon written sources, there is much that is suggestive in the various theories concerning his original informants or sources of knowledge. The elaborate analyses of Spitta, Jungst, and others, all of which are based on the assumption that Acts is the work of a second century writer who collected and edited a number of sources of varying degrees of trustworthiness, need not detain us, and we may proceed to the more useful task of considering some "source" schemes which assume the Lucan authorship of the book.

There is no difficulty with regard to the latter half of the book, from chap. xvi. onwards, which is practically a biographical sketch of phases of St. Paul's life and work. In the "we"-sections we have extracts from a travel-diary kept by the author himself, and in the remainder he is dependent upon the reports of eye-witnesses who, at different times, were his own companions and fellow-workers. The story of the first and second Missionary Journeys he perhaps derived from Timothy, or from Gaius and Aristarchus. Much of the material in this section he must have heard from the lips of the Apostle himself. It is by no means impossible that St. Luke was in close intercourse with St. Paul on occasions when he does not use the "we" in his narrative, as *e.g.* during the two years' imprisonment at Caesarea. Luke's sources in the first half of the book, chaps. i.-xv., are not so easy to determine, and allow for a considerable

range of opinion. Harnack [1] has devoted a considerable section of his *Acts of the Apostles* to an attempt to frame an analysis of Luke's sources in this section of Acts. He postulates three main sources:—

1. *A.* Comprising chaps. iii. 1–v. 6 : viii. 5-40 : ix. 31–xi. 18 : xii. 1-23, which contain the history of the outpouring of the Holy spirit and its consequences: Philip's mission to Samaria : a section exclusively confined to certain doings of St. Peter : and an account of St. Peter's escape from prison.

   B. Comprising chaps. ii. and v. 17-42. This is practically a doublet of iii. 1–v. 6, and gives a different version of the outpouring of the Spirit and its results.

2. A *Jerusalem-Antiochean source* comprising chaps. vi. 1–viii. 4 : xi. 19-30 : xii. 25–xv. 35, which contains the election of the Seven, the speech and martyrdom of Stephen, the dispersion of the Church of Jerusalem : the founding of the Church at Antioch, the visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem : the first Missionary Journey from Antioch, and the Judaistic controversy, closing with the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem.

3. To these we may add chap. ix. 1-30, the story of the Conversion from a Pauline source.

The first chapter has been definitely left on one side by him because he considers that it is probably the latest tradition in Acts and was inserted by Luke on the authority of a legend of very advanced standpoint.

1. *A.* This is a Jerusalem-Caesarean source. The whole of the section is closely connected with Jerusalem, but Caesarea is also prominent throughout.

[1] Harnack, *op. cit.* pp. 162-247.

Thus Philip is connected with the latter and probably made his home there (Acts viii. 40 and xxi. 8, 9). Cornelius is also stationed at Caesarea, and the brethren who conducted St. Paul from Jerusalem to Tarsus came as far as that city (Acts ix. 30). The scene of Herod's death is also placed at Caesarea. There are two great names associated with this source, St. Peter and St. Philip, but in unequal proportions The narrative contained in it is in the main derived from Philip, or from him and his daughters. Certain incidents, however, may be traced to St. Mark, more especially the story of the escape of St. Peter from prison in chap. xii.

B. This, which is a recension of *A*, is comparatively worthless, and there is no evidence to help us to discover the person upon whose authority the account rests. The narrative certainly proceeded from Jerusalem or Palestine.

2. *A Jerusalem-Antiochean Source.*—The sections included in this source give us a single connected narrative, the soul of which is from the first Antioch and the mission to the Gentiles. It begins with the controversy in Jerusalem between Hebrews and Hellenists, and shows us how the martyrdom of Stephen and the persecution which followed led to the foundation of the Church at Antioch as the first-fruits of the mission to the Gentiles. It then traces the extension of that mission to the Gentile world by Barnabas and Paul, and tells us how it was finally recognised by the mother Church of Jerusalem at a Council specially convened for that purpose. This is, according to Harnack, of high historical value, with the possible exception of chap. xi. 30 and xii. 25 (containing the record of the journey of Barnabas and

Paul to Jerusalem, the identification of which has been the cause of endless controversy), and the account of the first Missionary Journey, which is not so vivid in its style and not so trustworthy as the greater part of the narrative in the second part of Acts. He suggests that in these sections, which form a homogeneous and closely connected group, St. Luke was dependent upon information supplied by Silas, who was connected with both Jerusalem and Antioch, was appointed an ambassador from the Church of Jerusalem to that of Antioch, and stayed for a considerable time in the latter city. Harnack thinks that this source in some parts shows decided signs of having existed in a written form.

Another suggestive enquiry into the sources of the earlier chapters of Acts is found in a series of papers by Ramsay on "The Authorities used in Acts i.-xii." in the *Expositor*, vii. 7. pp. 172 f., 262 f., 358 f., and 450 f.

In chap. i. Ramsay thinks that Luke possibly utilised some official *acta* of the primitive Christian community, and that the title of Acts, which was originally confined to this introductory chapter, may have been eventually extended to the whole book.

Chaps. ii.-x.—These came from one of the converts at the first Pentecost, who afterwards was a member of the Church of Jerusalem. He was present at the trial of the Apostles as well as that of Stephen, and witnessed the visit of St. Peter to Cornelius at Caesarea. He was also an intense admirer of St. Peter, and was keenly interested in the affair of Cornelius and in the admission of the Gentiles into the Church.

All this points unmistakably to Philip as Luke's

authority in this portion of his work, and Ramsay considers that the very manner in which Philip's name is introduced by Luke into the narrative is an indirect indication of the identity of his informant. There are in this section, however, two passages which Ramsay assigns to authorities other than Philip, viz. chap. ii. 1-13, which contains the account of the descent of the Holy Spirit, and chap. viii. 26-40, which narrates the story of the baptism of the Eunuch by Philip.

(*a*) *Chap. ii.* 1-13.—The narrative here differs materially from the speech of St. Peter, which follows immediately afterwards, and which deals with the same event. This gives a different impression of the scene. In the narrative, *e.g.* the emphasis is on the gift of "tongues," whereas Peter knows nothing of this phenomenon, but is solely concerned with "prophetic utterance." Ramsay considers that Philip has correctly reproduced the speech, but that the narrative which precedes it has come from another source. This probably represents a popular description of the first occasion on which the influence of the Holy Spirit was manifested in the Church, and was derived from the account which was current in the Church of Jerusalem.

(*b*) *Chap. viii.* 26-40.—In this passage, which tells the story of the conversion and baptism of the Eunuch, the self-suppression and humility which characterised the description of the mission to Samaria are conspicuous by their absence. It is, therefore, probable that Philip himself is not the authority here. The picture is evidently drawn by an admirer of Philip, and Ramsay suggests that for this particular narrative Luke was indebted to one (or all) of Philip's daughters.

Chap. xi. 1-19.—This chapter contains the report of the scene in Jerusalem when St. Peter's action with regard to Cornelius was called in question, and in some measure reproduces the substance of the previous chapter. It has been noticed that the passage contains a larger amount of characteristic Lucan phraseology than the account in chap. x., and it is suggested that here Luke is no longer dependent upon an authority of the rank of Philip, and, therefore, felt justified in dealing more freely with his source and in giving more scope to his own style and diction. Ramsay does not specify any particular name in connection with this chapter.

Chap. xii., St. Peter's Escape from Prison.—The facts related in this narrative must have come ultimately from St. Peter himself, but, according to Ramsay, the recital in Acts came from Rhoda the maid. "The story is that of a Christian who had listened to Peter; it has all the character of a narrative of a spectator who was present in Mary's house, and listened with eager interest and retentive memory to his hurried account of his deliverance." [1]

The Relation of Acts to Galatians.—Many scholars who unreservedly accept the Lucan authorship of Acts experience considerable difficulty in assigning to it the position of high rank as a historical document which is claimed for it by Ramsay, for instance. The question of the historical value of the book reaches its climax in the discussion of the story of the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem in Acts xv., and more especially in connection with that portion of the chapter (xv. 28-30) in which the formal and official decision of the Council is quoted. The

[1] Ramsay, *Expositor*, vii. 7. p. 278.

historicity of the Apostolic Decrees is challenged mainly on the ground that they are directly at variance with St. Paul's teaching and practice as set forth in the Epistles as a whole, and more particularly with Gal. ii. 6, where the Apostle declares that "they who were of repute imparted nothing to me," and with 1 Cor. viii., where his silence concerning the Decrees is pronounced to be inexplicable if such a document had been already put into circulation.

Two theories have recently been put forward which claim to remove the difficulty formerly entertained as to the historicity of the Apostolic Decrees, the one concerned with the character of the Decrees themselves, and the other with the date of Galatians, both of which demand further consideration.

1. *The Apostolic Decrees.*—The solution of the problem which we are about to discuss consists in the adoption of the Western text of the Decrees in a modified form. This text is given in D (*Codex Bezae*), is found in most of the Latin versions, and in Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian, and is the version generally accepted in the Latin countries of the West. The Eastern version, which is found in all the Uncial MSS. except D, and in the Greek Fathers, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, is that which appears in the English revised version of the New Testament. This reads: "ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων καὶ αἵματος καὶ πνικτῶν καὶ πορνείας· ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτούς, εὖ πράξετε·," and is translated by the revisers: "That ye abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, it shall be well with you." The Western text omits "πνικτῶν" ("things strangled"), and inserts after "πορνείας"

(" fornication ") a negative form of the " golden rule," " ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἑτέρῳ μὴ ποιεῖτε " (" what you would not have done to you do not to another "), and closes with a reference to the Holy Spirit, " φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι " (" being carried along by the Holy Spirit ").

Now the difference in scope and character between the two versions is perfectly clear. The first gives us a four-clause document, three of which formulate conditions for regulating social intercourse between Jewish and Gentile Christians, or in other words, constitute a " food-law," with an additional clause of a different character; while the second, which also contains four clauses, can be quite plausibly interpreted as a mere catalogue of moral precepts. It is not, however, the Western in its completeness that is proposed for our acceptance in this theory, but a shortened form of it obtained by a combination of the reading in D, with another version found in Tertullian,[1] which omits the " golden rule " as well as " things strangled." This gives us (omitting the reference to the Holy Spirit as an obvious interpolation) the Decrees no longer in a four-clause, but in a three-clause, form, in which reference to both the " golden rule " and to " things strangled " drops out. It is now maintained by many scholars that this must have been the original reading.

This theory owes its origin to a Continental scholar, G. Resch, who put it forth in a work entitled, *Das Apostelдecret nach seiner ausserkanonischer Textgestalt*, 1905. It has received the support of no less an authority than Wellhausen,[2] has been accepted by

[1] Tertullian, *De pudicitia*, 12.

[2] Wellhausen, *Noten zur Apostelgeschichte*, vol. iii. p. 19 f.

Harnack,[1] who devotes a considerable space to its discussion in his *Acts of the Apostles*, and, finally, is most ably and lucidly advocated by Kirsopp Lake in his work on *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul.*

Now the importance of this new theory in the minds of those who advocate it lies in the fact that it is supposed to do away with the difficulties associated with the Decrees in their traditional form. If the Decrees are nothing more than a series of moral precepts they are no longer irreconcilable with Galatians ii. 6. Harnack in his forcible way declares that the three-clause form removes all difficulty with regard to Acts xv., and that we can close whole libraries of commentaries and investigations as documents of the history of a gigantic error, and that the scribe who wrote the little word πνικτῶν opposite αἵματος in the margin of the copy, from which it crept into the text, has for almost two thousand years swamped the correct interpretation of the whole passage.

If this version of the Decrees is accepted as correct it undoubtedly calls for a complete revision of opinion among the great majority of scholars as to the character of the Apostolic Council, its results, and as to the whole course of the Judaistic controversy. There is in this form of the Decrees no suggestion of a compromise, no attempt to meet the reasonable demands of the Jewish Christians. It is no longer a question of regulations to simplify social intercourse between Jew and Gentile within the Christian Church, and there is no trace of any accommodation to Jewish prejudices in return for the abandonment of the demand for the circumcision of Gentile converts.

[1] Harnack, *op. cit.* p. 249 f.

The Decrees in their new form simply register the demand of the Christian Church that Gentile Christians should observe the ordinary rules of morality, and should abstain from idolatry, murder, and fornication. The Gentile Churches had won a victory all along the line, and in Professor Kirsopp Lake's words, " They conceded nothing and gained a triumph of the most far-reaching consequences." [1]

From the point of view of textual criticism there would seem to be no insuperable objection to the adoption of the shortened version of the Western text as the original form in which the Decrees appeared, although it is a somewhat large order to give the preference to D in the matter of the omission of " things strangled " as against the evidence of all the other Uncials. There is much force, however, in the contention that as the different readings are found, the one in Clement of Alexandria, and the other in Irenaeus, they must have originated as early as the second century, and as none of our extant MSS. are of earlier date than the fourth century there is more than a sufficient interval of time available for the readings to become stereotyped. But from the standpoint of historical criticism the theory is confronted with difficulties which, in my opinion, make its acceptance a very questionable proceeding, and I may add that this view is endorsed by Sir W. M. Ramsay.[2]

I will formulate as briefly as possible some of the main objections to the adoption of the modified Western text of the Decrees from the point of view of historical criticism.

[1] See *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1911, p. 365.
[2] See *Expositor*, viii. 5. 141.

(*a*) If the Apostolic Council ended in the complete triumph of the Gentile section of the Church, the circumcision of Timothy by St. Paul after the Council is absolutely unintelligible.

(*b*) It does not remove the difficulty connected with Gal. ii. 6 in spite of Harnack's statement to the contrary. The suggested change in the character of the Decrees does not make St. Paul's assertion "that they of repute imparted nothing to me" any more justifiable than it was under the old rendering.

(*c*) The theory leaves the Epistle to the Galatians entirely in the air utterly unrelated to any known course of historical events.

(*d*) It is difficult to understand the relevancy of St. James' reference to the Decrees in Acts xxi. 25 if they referred solely to the rudimentary principles of morality.

(*e*) The theory fails to account for the continued existence of the Judaistic controversy.[1]

2. *The Date of Galatians.*—A second attempt to remove the difficulty raised by the silence of St. Paul in Galatians ii. 1-10 concerning the Apostolic Council and its outcome is the adoption of a very early date for that Epistle. There is an increasing tendency among scholars to regard Galatians not only as the earliest of all the Pauline Epistles, but to demand that it must have been written before the Apostolic Council. This early date for the Epistle was suggested centuries ago by Calvin and Beza, and the theory has been again revived and receives the support of scholars like Valentin Weber,[2] Douglass Round,[3]

[1] For a complete discussion of this theory the reader is referred to an article by the writer in the *Expositor*, viii. 5. p. 242 f.

[2] Weber, *Die Abfassung des Galaterbriefs vor dem Apostel-Konzil*, p. 15.

[3] Douglass Round, *The Date of Galatians*, *passim*.

C. W. Emmet,[1] Vernon Bartlet,[2] and last but not least, Kirsopp Lake[3] and Ramsay,[4] all of whom place the writing of the Epistle either at Syrian Antioch, just before St. Paul left for Jerusalem to take part in the Council, or on the journey between Antioch and Jerusalem. The question is discussed with great fulness by Kirsopp Lake in his illuminating book on *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul.* He contends that the Epistle was written after St. Paul's return from the first Missionary Journey, and shortly before the first Apostolic Council, not at Antioch but at some point on the journey between Antioch and Jerusalem. Now if we had nothing more than the Epistle to the Galatians to consider I am not disposed to say that this early date is altogether inadmissible although the Epistle itself seems to me to contain much evidence pointing to a fuller development of Pauline doctrine and organisation than is consistent with the pre-conciliar period. Acts has, however, an equal claim to be heard on this point, and if the early date of Galatians is adopted it becomes exceedingly difficult to credit the author with any historical accuracy, much less regard him as a historian of first rank. In this connection it should be noted that K. Lake accepts the Lucan authorship of Acts, and rates St. Luke as a historian of high character,[5] while Ramsay is the strongest living advocate of the historical value of Acts. It is not easy to understand how they reconcile their estimate of St. Luke as a careful historian with the repudiation of his clear statements which this date of Galatians involves.

The following are some of the main difficulties

[1] C. W. Emmet, *Galatians*, Introduction.
[2] Bartlet, *Apostolic Age*, p. 84.
[3] K. Lake, *op. cit.* p. 253 f.
[4] Ramsay, *Expositor*, viii. 5. p. 127 f.
[5] K. Lake, *op. cit.* p. 30.

based on the study of Acts with which this theory is confronted:

(*a*) *The Question of Time.*—There is no system of Pauline chronology which allows more than an interval of six months between the arrival of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch at the close of the first Missionary Journey and their departure for Jerusalem to attend the Council. This theory demands that in the space of these few short months time is to be found for the Apostles' report of their success in Galatia, the arousing of the jealousy of the Judaising party at Antioch, the organisation of a counter-mission to the same district, a thorough and successful anti-Pauline crusade in the cities of Galatia, and the reception by St. Paul of news of this disastrous enterprise. Travel and communication within the Roman Empire were doubtless much more expeditious than we are apt to consider them, but even in our own day six months is a most inadequate period wherein to produce the events and situation which the Epistle to the Galatians imply.

(*b*) *How are we to reconcile this Date with Acts xv.* 3 ?—St. Luke in Acts xv. 3, describing the progress of Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem, tells us that "they passed through both Phoenicia and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles; and they caused great joy unto all the brethren." Now if the Epistle to the Galatians was written at this period, St. Luke must have entirely misconceived the situation, and he ceases to have any claim to our respect as a serious historian. It has been suggested that this is another instance of the "argument from silence."[1] This is not a case of "silence" on St.

[1] C. W. Emmet, *Expository Times*, xxiv. p. 475.

Luke's part. If we had found no reference at all to Galatian affairs in Acts xv. much might be said in favour of this contention, but inasmuch as there is an allusion in the chapter, and that of the most definite character, implying at the least a satisfactory outlook in Galatia it is difficult to see where St. Luke's " silence " comes in. If the Galatians were in a state of open revolt against St. Paul's teaching and authority before the events recorded in Acts xv. took place, as this theory demands, Luke is only silent when he is faced with a disagreeable situation, and can be expressive enough when it comes to recording facts that suit his own purpose. This is nothing less than a return to the old Tübingen position, which saw in Acts a mere " tendency " document in which every difficulty was smoothed over, and every divergence and want of success were ignored in the interests of a particular theory.

(c) *How is St. Paul's Attitude at the Council to be explained if the Galatians were in open Rebellion and the Epistle had already been written?*—The only part taken by St. Paul in the deliberations of the Council is to quote the wonderful success of his mission among the cities of South Galatia as proof incontrovertible that all the blessings of Christianity were available for the Gentile world, and that without the medium of Judaism. Could he have honestly used such an argument if he had known, as he must have, according to this theory, that at the very time he was speaking, and in the very Churches he was quoting, there had been such a " set back " as to imperil their very Christianity, and that these identical Gentile Christians, whom he mentions with such pride as having received Christianity and all that Christianity implied, without

any Judaic conditions, were now drifting with dangerous rapidity in the contrary direction, and were evincing every desire to make their Christianity more complete by the addition of Jewish ordinances? Here again St. Luke is completely at fault in his conception of the situation if the condition of affairs in Galatia had already developed to anything like the extent that is implied in the Epistle.

(*d*) *Could Timothy have been circumcised by St. Paul after the Epistle to the Galatians had been written?* —If St. Paul had Timothy circumcised, as related in Acts xvi. 3, after he had used the language concerning "circumcision" and Jewish legalism generally which appears in Galatians, language whose bitterness and intensity it is difficult to exaggerate, it is no longer open to us to credit him with any consistency whatsoever. If we place the incident of the circumcision before the Epistle, and regard it as in some measure contributing to the success of the Judaistic propaganda, and as explaining some of the cryptic references to a charge of "preaching circumcision," which seems to have been brought against St. Paul, the event becomes intelligible. Ramsay[1] now substitutes the circumcision of Titus in place of that of Timothy as explaining the allusions in Gal. i. 8, 10 and v. 11, and supports his hypothesis by claiming that in translating Gal. ii. 3 the emphasis is to be placed on ἠναγκάσθη, so that the verse can only mean that "not even Titus was *compelled* to be circumcised," but accepted circumcision as a voluntary act on his part. A considerable amount of suspicion has been attached by many scholars to the historicity of the circumcision of Timothy, but he was at least half a Jew, and it will

[1] See *Expositor*, viii. 5. pp. 136-139.

require considerably more than the mere change of emphasis suggested by Ramsay to establish the fact that St. Paul ever countenanced the circumcision of a full-blooded Gentile, highly as we may rate his tact and diplomacy where the peace of the Church was concerned.[1]

St. Paul's Relation to Judaism and Jewish Christianity.—Much of the hostility displayed by critics towards the Lucan authorship of Acts is based on the alleged inconsistency between St. Paul's relation towards Judaism and Jewish Christianity as depicted in Acts and the impression we derive of his attitude towards these movements from his Epistles. Scholars like Schürer, Schmidt, and Jülicher go so far as to assert that no companion of St. Paul could conceivably have put in the mouth of the Apostle such statements as that found in Acts xxiii. 6, and that we must, therefore, either regard them as gross untruths, or banish the Epistles into the second century.

Moffatt,[2] however, very rightly points out that many of the difficulties in this connection are due to the assumption that because Luke was the friend and physician of the Apostle he must have necessarily been a Paulinist, and, therefore, a protagonist of St. Paul, sharing and understanding all his religious opinions, and assenting to his ecclesiastical policy in every respect. Critics are, therefore, not justified in taking for granted that Acts, even though written by St. Luke, must tally historically and theologically with St. Paul, or that the former's statements must invariably exhibit striking agreement with the Pauline

[1] The question of "The Date of Galatians" is dealt with more fully in a paper by the writer in the *Expositor*, viii. 6. pp. 193 f.

[2] Moffatt, *op. cit.* pp. 301-302.

Epistles. When the time at which, and the purpose for which St. Luke wrote are fairly considered and the idea that he was a Paulinist is abandoned, and when, in addition, we recognise the freedom with which he has treated the sources and traditions at his disposal, the difficulties lose much of their force and are not of sufficient importance to outweigh the very significant linguistic evidence in favour of the Lucan authorship.

Harnack[1] has also much to say with regard to this particular objection to the Lucan authorship, although he differs considerably from Moffatt in his method of disposing of it. According to him the critics have gone astray, not so much in connection with Acts, but rather in their interpretation of St. Paul's attitude towards Judaism and Jewish Christianity as manifested in the Epistles. His main point is that the Jew in St. Paul has not been sufficiently recognised by these scholars, and that too much stress has been laid on the description of the Apostle's attitude to the Law in Galatians as if it were a complete and exclusive representation of his mind instead of a temporary position acquired, and sharply defined, in a period of acute controversy. On the other hand, St. Paul's pronouncement in 1 Cor. ix. 20, "To the Jews I became a Jew," is invariably explained by them as a concession to motives of accommodation.

Harnack calls attention to the fact that there were two positions held by St. Paul with reference to the Law: (1) It is preserved in force as a customary rule of life *for a particular circle of men.* (2) God has abolished the Law as a means of attaining to righteousness *for all men*, and, therefore, also for those for

[1] Harnack, *Date of Acts and Synoptic Gospels*, pp. 39-88.

whom it is still in force. He thus recognised the God-given privileges of the Jewish nation, and, at the same time, by his work as a missionary he abolished them. Two apparently contradictory principles were, therefore, at work in the Apostle, and all through his life he never quite succeeded in making himself appear as a consistent man. He had a lofty conception of the true universality of the Gospel of Christ, but the Jew was too strong in him to allow that conception to be developed to its logical conclusion in his own work and person. It was his fidelity to this patriotic and national sentiment that ultimately robbed him of liberty and life. He went up from Corinth to Jerusalem instead of proceeding direct to Rome because he felt bound to take a personal part in delivering the offering for "the saints," and this indirectly led to his arrest and imprisonment. His great missionary work was interrupted because he could not divest himself of the feeling of national piety towards his own Jewish brethren. We are to recognise in St. Paul then the transition stage in the development of Christianity from a Judaic sect to an independent religion, and once we realise the Apostle's Jewish limitations his attitude towards Judaism and Jewish Christianity as pictured in the Acts becomes perfectly intelligible and is in essential agreement with that represented in the Epistles. Harnack's treatment of this question is quite admirable and provides a much-needed protest against the narrow, restricted, and mechanical aspect of St. Paul's personality and character which has become a commonplace with a certain type of critic.

The Date of Acts.—The acceptance of the Lucan authorship of Acts rules out of court any date

later than the close of the first century, and the criticism of scholars like Schmiedel,[1] which postulates a date somewhere between A.D. 105 and 130, is no longer valid. The *terminus ad quem* now depends upon the view that is taken of the relation of the Lucan writings to those of Josephus. If St. Luke, both in the Gospel and Acts, is dependent upon the writings of Josephus as a whole, as is held by Peake,[2] Burkitt,[3] and others, we are tied down to a date not earlier than A.D. 95 for the Gospel, and somewhere as late as A.D. 100 for Acts. This is not impossible, because, if St. Luke was still a young man when he first became associated with St. Paul, he need not have been more than seventy when the first century drew to a close. Stanton[4] discusses very minutely the question of Luke's dependence upon Josephus, and arrives at the conclusion that we may dismiss the idea that Luke used the *Antiquities*, *Contra Apionem*, or the *Autobiography*. He thinks it probable that he had read the *Jewish War*, and this would bring the Gospel as far back as A.D. 80 and the Acts a few years later. The inferences from the coincidences with Josephus are, however, so precarious that there seems to me no sound reason why a date from A.D. 75–80 should not be quite admissible, and this is the view of the majority of scholars. A date earlier than A.D. 70 is generally ruled out, because it is maintained that the Third Gospel contains the clearest evidence that it was written after the destruction of Jerusalem.

[1] Schmiedel, *Ency. Bibl.* vol. i. col. 49.
[2] Peake, *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 135.
[3] Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, chap. iv.
[4] Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part II. pp. 263-273.

A strenuous advocate of a still earlier date for Acts has recently appeared in the person of Harnack, who maintains that it must have been written during the lifetime of St. Paul, and, therefore, at some point in the early sixties. He had already suggested this date in his *Acts of the Apostles*, and in his later work on the *Date of Acts and Synoptic Gospels* the hypothesis is developed with considerable vigour. His main arguments in favour of the early date may be summarised as follows :

1. *Negative* indications in Acts of an early date.

(*a*) The conclusion of Acts and its silence concerning the result of St. Paul's trial make it in the highest degree probable that the work was written at a time when the ordeal at Rome had not yet taken place. St. Luke has so carefully traced all the earlier stages of the trial that it is most unlikely that he should have left out the final scene. Again neither St. Peter nor St. Paul are treated in Acts as if the death of either of them was presupposed, although Luke manifests all through the book a tendency to foretell events.

(*b*) There is no trace in Acts of the rebellion of the Jews, of the destruction of Jerusalem, or of the persecution of Nero, and not a hint that the ruin of Jerusalem has come as a punishment upon the nation. Luke has preserved absolute silence concerning everything that happened in the years A.D. 64–70, and the book must, therefore, have been written before the former of these two dates.

(*c*) There is no use made of the Pauline Epistles in Acts.

(*d*) The prophecy in Acts xx. 25, 38, that the

Ephesian Christians would see the Apostle's face no more. If the Apostle was released after his first trial and paid a subsequent visit to Asia Minor, as Harnack[1] and many others maintain to have been the case, this prophecy was refuted by facts, and these verses, therefore, afford strong testimony that Luke wrote previous to these events.

2. *Positive* evidence in Acts of an early date.

(*a*) *Terminology.*—(1) The use of the terms Ἰησοῦς, ὁ Κύριος, ὁ Χριστός, points to a stage previous to St. Paul's or any Gentile Christian after him. It is primitive and presupposes a circle of readers still in connection with Judaism.

(2) ὁ Παῖς Θεοῦ. The phrase is never used in the Gospels or in the New Testament Epistles, but it appears four times in Acts (cf. iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30). It must, therefore, have been associated with a very early stage of Christology.

(3) The use of οἱ Χριστιανοί and οἱ μαθηταί. The former is not used by Christians themselves but is attached to them from outside, and St. Luke never uses it. The evidence of 1 Peter shows, however, that the name had already come into common use among Christian believers, especially in the Asiatic provinces. The second term had dropped out of Paul's vocabulary.

(4) Ἡ ἐκκλησία. This word, although found twenty-three times in Acts, never appears as the peculiar or regular name for Christians, but is used for a community either Jewish or Gentile.

(*b*) *The Christology of Acts.*—There is no trace of the so-called higher Christology as St. Paul proclaimed it to be found in the Acts of the Apostles or in the

[1] Harnack, *op. cit.* pp. 90-134.

Third Gospel. St. Luke remains far behind the Apostle in his doctrine concerning Christ, and in complete independence holds fast to a Christology which is absolutely primitive.

The conclusion that Harnack arrives at is that Acts, taken by itself, points to a date before the destruction of Jerusalem and the death of St. Paul, and that we have thus a *terminus ad quem* for the dates of the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, provided always that the Gospels themselves do not make this date impossible.

The Date of St. Luke.—With respect to the date of the Third Gospel he is of opinion that no weight need be attached to St. Luke's assumed knowledge of Josephus, and that there is nothing in St. Luke xxi. 20-24, a passage which is almost universally taken to point to a date subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem, to compel us to assume or even to suggest to us that this event had already happened. If the Gospel was written before A.D. 70 there is no reason why it should not have been written ten years earlier, which would make a date for Acts within the lifetime of St. Paul quite admissible.

The Date of St. Mark.—This Gospel is universally acknowledged to be earlier than St. Luke. The thirteenth chapter makes it quite clear that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and Harnack declares that there is no internal evidence to prevent our assigning it to a date in the sixth decade of the first century.

I am bound to confess that I am by no means convinced as to the correctness of Harnack's dating of any of these documents except the Second Gospel. There are several weak links in the chain of

arguments, and, in some cases, he is not even consistent with his own explicit declarations elsewhere. The strong point that he makes of the silence of St. Luke as to the trial and fate of St. Paul is vitiated by his own emphasis upon the fact that St. Luke is not primarily concerned even with St. Paul, and that the main motive of the Acts is the expansion of Christianity and the victorious progress of the Gospel across the world from Jerusalem to Rome. It is perfectly intelligible that once Rome is reached and the Gospel, in the person of its greatest representative, and the Gentile world are face to face in the Imperial capital the author considered that he had arrived at a point where his narrative might be brought to a fitting and dramatic close. It is not improbable that considerations of space may also have had some influence upon St. Luke's procedure. The MS. roll had already reached a length which was normal, and any additions to it might well have been thought undesirable. Some weight may also be attached to the suggestion, which many find attractive, that St. Luke had planned a third work, and that in this sequel he purposed to follow the fortunes of St. Paul to the end.

The arguments based on the terminology of Acts are not very convincing. Some of the phrases quoted are taken from the earlier chapters of Acts, as *e.g.* ὁ Παῖς Θεοῦ, and if St. Luke was here dependent upon written sources, as Harnack himself thinks probable, the primitive terminology is not due to St. Luke but to the original sources, which he has not thought necessary to alter in this respect. He also dismisses somewhat too lightly the very strong evidence for a date subsequent to the destruction

of Jerusalem which is furnished by St. Luke xxi. 20-24.

The hypothesis that Acts was written about A.D. 80 is on the whole more satisfactory than Harnack's theory of a date within the lifetime of St. Paul.

CHAPTER III

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL

Literature for Chapter III.

Wrede, "Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs" (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, ix. 2, 1903).
Armitage Robinson, *The Epistle to the Ephesians.* 1903.
Clemen, *Paulus.* 1905.
Von Soden, *The Writings of the New Testament.* 1906.
Milligan, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians.* 1908.
Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament.* 1909. E.T.
R. Shaw, *The Pauline Epistles.* 1909.
Rutherfurd, *The Epistle to the Colossians viewed in Relation to the Epistle to the Ephesians.* 1910.
Knowling, *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ.* 1911.
K. Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul.* 1911.
Ramsay, "Historical Commentary on 1 Timothy," *Expositor*, vii. 7-9, viii. 1. 1909–1911.
Milligan, *The New Testament Documents.* 1912.
Harnack, *Das Problem des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs.* 1910.
Lock, Articles on "Ephesians" and "Epistles to Timothy and Titus" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*
M'Giffert, Article on "Thessalonians" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*
Jülicher, Article on "Colossians and Ephesians" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*
Van Manen, Article on "Paul" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*
Vernon Bartlet, "The Historic Setting of the Pastoral Epistles," *Expositor*, viii. 5.
A. Souter, "The Epistle to the Ephesians not a Secondary Production," *Expositor*, viii. 2.

Introductory.—There is no department of New Testament criticism which we can approach with a greater degree of satisfaction than that which is concerned with the Epistles of St. Paul. Here at any rate criticism is slowly but surely reaching a stage where something approximating to a unanimity

may be looked for, a condition of affairs that is difficult to prophesy with regard to any other section of the New Testament documents. To put the matter briefly, the Pauline letters now stand much where they stood a century ago when the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles only was seriously called in question. It would be difficult to produce a more striking illustration of the trend of nineteenth-century literary criticism as described by Professor Saintsbury, and already quoted,[1] than the treatment which was dealt out to the Epistles of St. Paul during the last sixty years of that century. It is now sixty-eight years since Baur's famous book on St. Paul was published in which he reduced the number of authentic Pauline Epistles to four, the *Hauptbriefe*, as he called them, viz. the two Epistles to the Corinthians, Romans, and Galatians. It has been the task of the latest scholarship to restore to the pedestal from which they had been somewhat ruthlessly deposed the other letters which for seventeen centuries had commended themselves to the conscience of the Christian Church as the undoubted products of the mind and soul of the great Apostle. It is only just, however, to recognise the great importance of the services rendered in the field of Biblical criticism by Baur and the Tübingen school that he founded. The conclusions reached by the critics of the Tübingen type may not altogether commend themselves to us, but there is no denying the fact that they evolved methods and principles of criticism which have proved invaluable. They were the first to emphasise the close relation between history and religion, and to assign each document of the New Testament to some

[1] See p. 4.

phase or another in the historical development of the early Church. The present Bishop of Exeter writing in this connection, remarks: "We owe a deep debt of gratitude to the sincerity and courage of the Tübingen school. Truth, and therefore, piety, can only permanently be the gainer by the results of free investigation combined with ample consideration of the strength and weakness of every rational hypothesis." [1] Where Baur and his followers failed was in their lack of appreciation of the predominantly religious interests of the Apostolic age as distinguished from polemics.

The outcome of improved methods of criticism and of the greater respect paid to the religious atmosphere of the first century has been to add to Baur's *Hauptbriefe* the Epistles to the Colossians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon, which are now accepted as genuine by all except the extreme left wing of New Testament critics. Some hesitation is still felt with regard to 2 Thessalonians, although its authenticity is guaranteed by scholars of the stamp of Jülicher, Clemen, Bacon, and M'Giffert. This hesitation is more emphasised in the case of Ephesians, and the Pastoral Epistles still continue to form the storm centre of Pauline literary controversy.

It is necessary to refer very briefly to one school of Continental scholars, the best known representative of which is the Dutch Professor, van Manen, which has gone to far greater lengths than were ever contemplated by Baur in its criticism of the Pauline Epistles. Van Manen makes a clean sweep of all the letters, and boldly asserts that our knowledge of the Apostle is so defective that it is unwise to associate

[1] Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, p. 83.

anything of a very definite character with his personality.

These destructive theories have been recently revived by Kalthoff and Drews in Germany, and by J. M. Robertson in England, in the interests of the "Christ-Myth" theory.[1] We need not waste time in discussing criticism of this type, because it has entirely failed to commend itself even to advanced German scholars who might be expected to sympathise to some extent with conclusions so destructive in their character, and is altogether rejected by such writers as Holtzmann, Jülicher, and Clemen. Those who are desirous of a closer acquaintance with the views of van Manen and the Dutch school will find them set forth with much vigour in the pages of the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.

With this in the way of a general introduction we will now proceed to deal more in detail with those Epistles which still fail to command a general acceptance, viz. 2 Thessalonians, Ephesians, and the Pastoral Epistles.

The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians.—The question of the authenticity of this Epistle is one of the most interesting and keenly debated points of New Testament criticism. The hesitation felt as to its genuineness is not of recent origin and may be said to be practically as old as criticism itself. Doubts as to whether it was an authentic Pauline Epistle were expressed as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century, and the process has been continued down to our own day. Among modern scholars who deny the Pauline authorship are to be found Weizsäcker, H. Holtzmann, von Soden, and

[1] See Book I. Chapter V.

Wrede, who is perhaps the most conspicuous opponent of the traditional position. A great American scholar, Professor M'Giffert, while of opinion that the evidence points rather in the direction of the genuineness of the Epistle, speaks of it as being beset with serious difficulties and as being at best very doubtful.[1]

The Objections to the Genuineness of the Epistle.— The objections to the genuineness of the Epistle are based on two main considerations, not to mention others of a minor nature which need not detain us here.

1. It is affirmed that the apocalyptic passage in chap. ii. contains undoubted reference to events later than the lifetime of St. Paul, and that its contents are inconsistent with the Pauline eschatological teaching in the first Epistle.

2. Further it is maintained that the differences between the First and Second Epistles in style, thought, and more especially in the character of the communities addressed in each particular Epistle, are so marked that it is difficult to believe that they are the work of one and the same writer and addressed to one and the same Church.

1. To begin with the first objection, it is urged that the Epistle cannot possibly be Pauline because the apocalyptic passage contains clear reference to the "Nero redivivus" myth, and that its origin must, therefore, be later than the death of Nero, and *a fortiori* later than the death of St. Paul. It has, however, been conclusively proved by the researches of Bousset[2] and Charles[3] that the Antichrist legend, which evidently lies at the root of this much disputed

[1] M'Giffert, Article "Thessalonians," *Ency. Bibl.* vol. iv. p. 5045.
[2] Bousset, Article "Antichrist," *Ency. Bibl.* vol. i. p. 25 f.
[3] Charles, *The Ascension of Isaiah*, p. lxi. f.

passage, is quite independent of the "Nero-Myth," and that its history may be traced to a period anterior to the Apostle's death. Another fact which points to a date prior to the origin of this myth is the conception of the Roman power which dominates the passage. Rome is here represented as "the restraining power," but later on, at the time when the Apocalypse was written for instance, the Christian conception of the Empire has undergone a complete transformation. Rome is now Antichrist personified, drunk with "the blood of the prophets, and of the saints, and of all that have been slain on the earth" (Apocalypse xviii. 24).

With regard to the other point raised in this connection there would seem to be no real inconsistency between the teaching concerning the Parousia contained in the two Epistles. It is true that in 1 Thessalonians the Parousia is represented as close at hand and coming "like a thief in the night," with no mention of any sign by which it is to be preceded, whereas in 2 Thessalonians the writer protests against the idea that the day of the Lord "is at hand" (ἐνέστηκε), and distinctly affirms that the Parousia will not take place until "the man of lawlessness" has been revealed. But there is nothing in the Apostle's teaching on the Parousia in the First Epistle which makes it inconceivable that this should be preceded by the coming of the "man of lawlessness," nor again does the Second Epistle preclude the possibility of the approach of the Parousia in the near future. The opinion of Baur, who would have nothing to do with either of the Epistles as the work of St. Paul, is worth quoting on this point: "It is perfectly conceivable that one and the same writer, if he lived

so much in the thought of the Parousia as the two Epistles testify, should have looked at this mysterious subject in different circumstances and from different points of view, and so expressed himself regarding it in different ways." [1]

The first objection, then, which was thought at one time to have a serious bearing on the question, has been considerably discounted by recent criticism, and may be dismissed as of comparatively slight importance.

2. The second objection is, however, of a much weightier character, and must be seriously considered in any attempt to decide for or against the authenticity of the letter.

The problem is thus formulated by Wrede.[2] A comparison of the two letters to the Thessalonians presents us with a remarkable combination of similarity and difference. The language of the Epistles is largely the same, but the general tone is quite different, *e.g.* (*a*) 1 Thessalonians is full of the deepest and most heartfelt sympathy and friendship, while 2 Thessalonians is much cooler and more official in tone, and that spirit of intimate fellowship with his converts so characteristic of the Pauline letters generally is lacking in it.

(*b*) 1 Thessalonians implies that the Thessalonian Church was a pure Gentile community, while 2 Thessalonians not only contains no trace of Gentile thought and has no reference to anything implying Gentile origin, but is also marked by a strongly Jewish colouring, and in thought and language approaches more nearly to the Old Testament (although it has

[1] Baur, *Paul*, p. 488. E.T.
[2] See Wrede, *Die Echtheit des Thessalonicherbriefs*.

no actual quotations from it) than any book in the New Testament with the exception of the Apocalypse.

It is the second of these contrasts which in the opinion of Wrede is the most striking and is the principal cause of the suspicion attached to the genuineness of the letter.

If we accept the description of the two letters in the foregoing paragraph as true to the facts it certainly becomes exceedingly difficult to understand how two letters written by the Apostle within such a short space of time, and to the same Christian community, could exhibit such vital differences. Wrede maintains that the discrepancy is quite fatal to the theory of the Pauline authorship of the Second Epistle. His view of the matter is that this Epistle is the work of an unknown writer who was anxious to gain currency for his own eschatological ideas. In order to counteract the impression produced by St. Paul in the First Epistle that the Parousia was imminent he published this letter with the warning that the Parousia must be preceded by the coming of Antichrist, and to achieve the further purpose of obtaining a hearing for his teaching he encased his letter in a Pauline framework and issued it as a Pauline letter.

Quite recently, however, a new and interesting solution of the difficulty has been propounded by no less an authority than Harnack.[1] He recognises the striking differences between the two letters, both in respect of their tone and of the character of the community addressed in each. He explains these features, however, not by rejecting the Pauline authorship of the Second Epistle, but by suggesting that the Church of Thessalonica was composed of

[1] Harnack, *Das Problem des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs.*

two separate sections, a Gentile and a Jewish section, the former of which was much the larger and more important element. The First Epistle was directed to the Gentile Christian community, and then, in order to restore the balance between the two sections, the Apostle addressed a second letter to the Jewish Christians. Harnack maintains that there are evidences in the First Epistle of a cleavage within the Thessalonian Church, and considers that the emphatic instruction that that should be read by "all the brethren" and the stress laid elsewhere on "all the brethren" point in the same direction. A very cursory study of this Epistle certainly reveals many features that could not possibly be too acceptable to the Jewish converts, and Harnack concludes that the second letter was written for the special benefit of the latter, and in order to ensure peace between the two sections in the Thessalonian Church. Failing some such explanation as this he is prepared to accept Wrede's verdict and to reject the Pauline authorship.

I am by no means convinced, however, that the conditions confine us to a choice between Wrede's theory of a later writer and Harnack's suggestion that the letter was addressed to a Jewish section of the Church of Thessalonica. It is still arguable that the true relationship between the two Thessalonian Epistles is best explained on the supposition that they were both written by St. Paul, and both addressed to the one Christian community. In this case the particular features upon which the rejection of the Pauline authorship are based would be mainly accounted for by a change in the mood of the writer, the result to some extent of a change in his own

circumstances and those of the Church he had once again to address. That the Apostle himself was subject to rapid changes of feeling, that supreme confidence was often succeeded by despair and joy soon converted into sorrow, is written large on the surface of his letters. Again the evidence of the Acts and of the very letters we are discussing goes far to show that there were facts concerned with him personally, with the condition of the Church at Corinth where the letters were written, and with the Church of Thessalonica, which make it by no means difficult to understand the change which is noticeable as we pass from the one letter to the other. The report which had arrived from Thessalonica subsequent to the receipt of the first letter as to the state of the Church in that city was not without its grave features. There is an increased restlessness among the converts, idleness is rife among them, and disorderly brethren are a serious anxiety. The condition of the Thessalonian Church was weighing heavily upon his mind, and his own position at Corinth, where he prays that " he may be delivered from unreasonable and evil men " (2 Thess. iii. 2), was threatened on all sides. Need we then be altogether surprised that the joyous, sympathetic tone of the First Epistle gives way to the more contained and sober spirit of the Second. It is in this direction that I am inclined to look for a solution of the problem of the authorship of 2 Thessalonians, and not in depriving the *corpus* of Pauline letters of a member which in many ways affords an invaluable illustration of certain phases of Pauline thought and spirit.[1]

[1] For a valuable defence of the authenticity of the Epistle see Milligan's *Thessalonians*, p. lxxvi. f.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. — When we advance from the discussion of the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians to that of Ephesians the chorus of opposition increases in volume and becomes more articulate. Harnack, Jülicher, Deissmann, and Bacon are content with stating that the Pauline authorship is possible, while Clemen [1] and Moffatt [2] definitely place it among the sub-Pauline literature.

Objections to the Authenticity of the Epistle.—The following are the principal points upon which the objections to its authenticity are based:

1. *Its Literary Affinities with other New Testament Literature.* — Lock,[3] discussing this aspect of the question, acknowledges that there are points of comparison with the Synoptic Gospels, some very striking similarities between the Epistle and the Fourth Gospel, and also between it and the Apocalypse, and still more frequent points of contact with 1 Peter. He is of opinion, however, that the affinities with the Synoptics do not prove literary dependence, and that the similarity to the Fourth Gospel is mainly one of thought, but that the points of contact with 1 Peter present a stronger probability of literary dependence. Moffatt, dealing with the same factors, comes to the conclusion that the literary relations of the Epistle with Colossians, St. Luke, and the Johannine literature, as well as with 1 Peter and the Pastorals, point to a date later than the time of St. Paul.

2. *The Language of the Epistle.*—There are in the Epistle thirty-eight words never used elsewhere in the New Testament, and forty-four which are found

[1] Clemen, *Paulus*, vol. i. p. 138 f.
[2] Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, p. 388.
[3] Lock, Article "Ephesians" in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, p. 716.

elsewhere in the New Testament but never used by St. Paul except here. The use of ὁ διάβολος instead of ὁ Σατανᾶς in accordance with St. Paul's invariable custom, and the recurrence of such terms as ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (five times in this Epistle) have given rise to much suspicion, while the place of honour assigned to the Apostles (the phrase "the Holy Apostles" is used twice in the letter as well as the expression "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets") would seem to point to a later age, when reverence for the Apostolic name had reached a higher stage than was possible while they were still alive.

The *language* of the Epistle, however, cannot be said to be decisive against the Pauline authorship, but the question of style is more serious. The difficulty here is considerably increased if we accept the traditional theory that Colossians and Ephesians were written by the Apostle and in close proximity to each other. Sanday, discussing the marked difference in style between these two Epistles, writes: "The old vivacity appears to be lost. The sentences and paragraphs become longer and more involved. The tone of challenge dies out. Even the affectionateness seems buried in weighty but almost laboured disquisitions." [1]

Moffatt,[2] summing up the argument from the style of the Epistle, states that the cumulative impression of the Epistle from this point of view is that it is the work of a writer who occupies a later standpoint of his own, and that it is difficult to imagine that St. Paul suddenly adopted this new style of

[1] Sanday, *Criticism of the New Testament* (St. Margaret Lectures), p. 22.
[2] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 388.

writing and then as suddenly abandoned it, when he came to write Philippians for instance.

3. *The Changed Position of Parties within the Church.*—A further objection is urged that the position of parties in the Church as described in the Epistle is not in accordance with what we know of their relations to each other from the Pauline writings generally. Elsewhere St. Paul is the champion of the Gentiles against Jewish narrowness, but here, on the contrary, he reminds Gentiles of the privileges of the Jews and becomes the advocate of Jewish Christians against Gentile exclusiveness. Again it is maintained that the conception of the Church as constituted by the union of Jew and Gentile, which obtains in this Epistle, is peculiar, and different from what we might expect from the Apostle, who never represents the union of Jew and Gentile as the aim and purpose of the redemptive work of Christ quite in the way that it is done here.

4. *The Position assigned to Christ and to the Church in the Epistle.*—Finally it is objected that the Christology of the Epistle and the enhanced ideals of the greatness of the Church found in it speak of a period when Christian thought and ecclesiastical conceptions had reached a stage of development that was quite inconceivable within the lifetime of St. Paul.

The Case for the Pauline Authorship.—Some of these objections possess considerable force, and their cumulative effect is at first sight formidable. It is not until we study the Epistle carefully from every point of view, and not merely with the object of discovering evidence that points to an origin other than Pauline, that we are able to reduce some of them to their true proportions.

1. Let us begin with the argument based on the literary relationships of the Epistle.

As a useful illustration of the literary argument we will take Moffatt's assertion that "Ephesians may be fairly regarded as a set of variations played by a master hand upon one or two themes suggested by Colossians."[1] Now Dr. A. Souter[2] has produced textual evidence which seems to show that this statement represents a practical impossibility. Recent textual research would appear to prove that the original reading of Ephesians i. 15 is that adopted in the Revised Version, where the τὴν ἀγάπην of the Textus Receptus is omitted, thus giving us a text that is exceedingly difficult to translate. Now in the parallel passage in Colossians i. 4 the words τὴν ἀγάπην are genuine and make excellent sense, and it is hardly conceivable that a copyist working with Colossians as his basis would leave out these two words, and thus convert a plain straightforward clause into one that will hardly translate at all. (Souter does translate it by making εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους equivalent to ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἁγίοις, in accordance with New Testament usage elsewhere.) If the original reading then omitted the τὴν ἀγάπην, as the latest evidence available proves to have been the case, it is quite clear that Ephesians is not a mere copy of Colossians, as suggested by Moffatt and others.

2. Then, again, the argument from *the advanced Christology of the Epistle* is not particularly convincing. The position assigned to Christ in Ephesians is little superior to that which he occupies in Colossians, and if there is a slight advance in this direction it is

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 375.
[2] Souter, *Expositor*, viii. 2, pp. 136-141, 321-328.

an advance that follows a line already marked out in previous letters. I have not been able to discover in the Christology of the Ephesians language more exalted concerning the prerogatives of Christ than that which St. Paul himself employs in Colossians i. 13-23.

The conception of the Church set forth in the Epistle is lofty, but the ideas presented here explicitly are already suggested in the earlier Epistles, more especially in 1 Corinthians, where we find allusions to the Church as the body of Christ (1 Cor. xii. 27), the unity of the Church (1 Cor. iv. 17, xv. 3-11), and the inspiration of the Church by the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. xii.).

The organisation of the Church implied in the Epistle is by no means advanced, and is quite compatible with a date well within the lifetime of the Apostle.

3. The objection based on *the position of parties in the Church* to which the Epistle is addressed, seems to demand on the part of the Apostle a hard-and-fast line of thought and attitude which allow of no deviation, and on the part of the individual Christian communities an absolute similarity of conditions, neither of which it appears to me we have any right to look for. The position of parties outlined in this letter may be due to the peculiar circumstances of a particular Church or of a particular period in the life of the Apostle himself. That St. Paul could, and did occasionally, express himself in terms of high appreciation of the Jew and his privileges is made perfectly clear by a reference to Romans xi.

If we accept the arguments of those who reject the Pauline authorship as decisive we must then

suppose that the Epistle was a homily written by a Jewish-Christian Paulinist steeped in St. Paul's language and strongly imbued with his spirit, and designed with the object of being read by the Church as a manifesto of St. Paul's mind upon the situation. It would be thus a "tract for the times," insisting on the irenic needs of the Church and on the duty of transcending the older schisms which had embittered the two sections of Christendom.[1]

I am, however, by no means convinced that we are tied down to this conclusion. The view held by such scholars as Hort, Rutherfurd, and Harnack, that the Epistle forms one of a triad, with Colossians and Philemon, written much about the same time, and dispatched to their destinations by means of Tychicus and Onesimus, still commends itself as offering the best solution of the problem.

The Pastoral Epistles.—The opposition to the authenticity of a section of the Pauline Epistles reaches its climax in connection with the Pastorals, which still remain the most keenly debated of all the Pauline letters. With the exception of Blass[2] and Zahn[3] there is hardly a voice raised in their favour among American and Continental scholars, and British scholarship is by no means too zealous in their defence, with the notable exception of Sir W. M. Ramsay,[4] who is a most strenuous advocate of their genuineness. A new adherent to the theory of the Pauline authorship has recently appeared in the person of Vernon Bartlet, of whom we shall have more to say in the sequel.

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 388.
[2] Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*, p. 24.
[3] Zahn, *I.N.T.* vol. i. p. 457 f.
[4] Ramsay, "Historical Commentary on 1 Timothy," *Expositor*, vii. 7–viii. 1.

Points of Agreement among all Critics.—It will be well to open our enquiry by noting the following points of general agreement among all critics, whether friendly or hostile to the Pauline authorship:

(*a*) All the three Epistles hang together, are the work of one author or editor, and must, therefore, be treated as an indivisible unity.

(*b*) The presence of some genuine material in the letters is almost universally acknowledged, and the possession by the author of fragments of St. Paul's correspondence as well as of some traditions, oral or written, which were not known to St. Luke, seems proved beyond a doubt. This feature is very much more prominent in 2 Timothy and Titus than in the third letter. It is 1 Timothy that presents the greatest difficulty and is the ground of the most serious objections to the Pauline authorship of the group. It is allowed by many even of the advanced critics that, if it were not for the presence of this particular Epistle, it might be possible to find room for the other two within the lifetime of St. Paul; but as all three bear undeniable proofs of their common origin the problem must be treated as a whole. The Pauline atmosphere is less manifest in 1 Timothy, which is said to be the latest in date and the furthest removed from the Apostle. All the elements upon which the hostility to the Pauline authorship is based are more marked here. There are fewer Pauline reminiscences, greater emphasis is laid upon ecclesiastical procedure, faith has now become an objective reality and not a mere subjective attitude, and soundness of doctrine is strictly insisted upon.

Arguments against the Genuineness of the Pastoral

Epistles.—The main arguments urged against the genuineness of the Pastorals may be summarised as follows:

1. *The Language of the Epistles is not Pauline, and the Style is open to the same Objection.*—There are no less than one hundred and eighty words which are not found elsewhere in the Apostle's writings, while, on the other hand, there is a significant absence of characteristically Pauline terms. Even the language of the greeting does not follow the normal Pauline pattern, and the author has a vocabulary all his own, which is full of unfamiliar compounds and Latinisms. The style of the letters is as un-Pauline as the vocabulary, and here, even more markedly than was the case in Ephesians, the rugged fervour and incisiveness of the Apostle are wanting.

2. *The Details of Church Government and Organisation are so elaborate* that they point to a generation later than that of St. Paul. The stage of development is not so advanced as that of the Ignatian letters, but the beginning of an ordered ministry with a monarchical bishop at its head is revealed here. Another feature that has given rise to considerable suspicion is the prohibition of the remarriage of widows, which is alleged to be strongly reminiscent of the strong prejudice against second marriages so frequently met with in Church writers of the second century.[1]

3. *The heresies combated in the Epistles have reached a period in their existence which cannot well fall within the lifetime of St. Paul*, and betray more signs of affinity with the ideas of heretical sects of the following century than with anything that is

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* pp. 410-411.

known to have been prevalent before the year A.D. 67, the last possible date of a genuine Pauline letter.

4. *The Christian Doctrine in the Epistles.*—What is said to be true of the Church organisation and heretical teaching is alleged to be equally applicable to the doctrine enunciated in the Epistles. The doctrine is essentially that of the Church at the close of the first century. Great emphasis is laid on the existence of a body of religious truth, the Gospel has already become stereotyped, and the Church's creed is now presented in technical crystallised phrases. Practical Christianity has also undergone a similar transformation, and what is now chiefly demanded of the Christian disciple is personal piety based on good works and a good conscience. The atmosphere is no longer that of the experimental religion of the Pauline period but rather that of the ecclesiastical zeal of a later age. The great cardinal truths of the Pauline Gospel, the Fatherhood of God, the believer's union with Christ, the power and witness of the spirit, the death unto sin and the new life unto righteousness, are conspicuous by their absence.

5. Lastly, we come to what is with some critics the strongest objection of all, viz. *the difficulty of fitting the letters into any authentic scheme of the events of St. Paul's life.* In connection with this objection it is asserted that the situation implied in the Epistles is an artificial one, and that it is difficult to conceive the Apostle condescending to write about such details as are found in 1 Timothy when he was contemplating a visit to Timothy in the near future.

These arguments have appealed with such force to the majority of New Testament scholars that they

have been constrained to abandon the Pauline authorship and to assign the letters to a member of the Pauline school who lived in the sub-Apostolic period, and who wrote them with the object of safeguarding the common Christianity of the age in terms of the great Pauline tradition. He was a whole-hearted follower of the Apostle, and to assist him in his task he had access to many Pauline literary remains, and was in possession of Pauline traditions of which we have no knowledge from any other source.

The Case for the Pauline Authorship of the Pastorals.—I would urge, however, that it is by no means necessary to allow judgment to go by default, and that in spite of the strong body of arguments that has been adduced to the contrary it is not difficult to present a powerful case in defence of the traditional theory.

1. *The External Evidence.*—We will first of all consider the external evidence for the authenticity of the Epistles, which in this particular case is exceedingly strong. They were familiar to Ignatius and Polycarp, and they have undoubted affinities with the letter of Clement. It is hardly possible to decide definitely on which side the literary dependence falls with reference to Clement, whether Clement was influenced by the Pastorals or *vice versa*, but the probabilities are certainly in favour of the former hypothesis. In this case the letters cannot have been written later than A.D. 80. Now there is no evidence to show that there was any marked development of doctrine or of ecclesiastical ideas and organisation between A.D. 60 and 80; and there is no valid reason why a condition of affairs which is accepted as being quite compatible with the later date should

be regarded as being quite out of the question some fifteen or twenty years previous to that date. The case for the Pauline authorship with reference to the external evidence, therefore, stands as follows. The literary relationship to the letter of Clement probably favours a date not later than A.D. 80, and there is no feature, doctrinal or ecclesiastical, belonging to this particular period which might not well have been in existence in the early sixties, when the Apostle was still alive and vigorous.

2. *Internal Evidence.*—There is also much in the internal evidence supplied by the Epistles themselves which supports the theory of their Pauline origin.

(*a*) The large number of proper names introduced into the letters, many of them not met with elsewhere in the New Testament, should be noted. If these names are not authentic and historical it is difficult to understand a second-century writer employing them, and thus subjecting himself to the risk of being denounced as a producer of fraudulent details by those who were thoroughly familiar with genuine Pauline literature. The same reasoning may be applied to the large number of references to concrete facts which occur in the Epistles, such as Titus' connection with Crete, and the personal touch which is so conspicuous in 1 Timothy v. 23, "Be no longer a drinker of water." This argument is of course considerably discounted if we allow that a later writer may have drawn upon fragments of other Pauline letters which contained these details.

(*b*) The impression that the letters give of the characters of Timothy and Titus argues strongly against the assumption of a second-century author. The description of the Christian leaders is not unduly

complimentary. What we are allowed to see in the Epistles are two young men who are in danger of being despised for their youth and inexperience, and who stand constantly in need of counsel and warning. It is easy to imagine St. Paul writing in this strain under the stress of actual conditions, but one fails to understand how an author, writing in the following century at a time when the memories of Timothy and Titus were much revered in the Church, could publish a description of them which differs so widely from the impression we derive concerning them from earlier Pauline literature. Another argument in the same direction comes from a very unexpected quarter. Mr. F. C. Conybeare, discussing the authorship of these Epistles, makes the following statement: "It is quite inconceivable that a forger of Pauline Epistles wishing, if not to honour St. Paul, at least not to bring him into disrepute, would attribute to him the statements that we find in 2 Timothy, namely that all the believers in Asia had 'turned away from him,' and that at the very first hearing of his appeal to Caesar in Rome 'No one took my part but all forsook me.' 'May it not be laid to their account,' he adds, showing how reprehensible he felt their desertion to be. A forger would not have thus gone out of his way to reveal to us that the entire Church of Rome belonged to the party of James and John, and that their hatred of the Apostle continued to be so intense that they abandoned him in his hour of need." [1]

We need not adopt Mr. Conybeare's explanation of the causes which led to the Apostle being deserted and left desolate at this juncture. By emphasising the fact that the desertion is mentioned in this Epistle

[1] Conybeare, *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, p. xvi.

he has, nevertheless, furnished a powerful argument for its authenticity.

(*c*) It is not quite accurate to assert that it is impossible to fit the letters into any known series of events in the Apostle's life. Tradition has always maintained that he was released after the first Roman imprisonment, and Harnack speaks of the release as an assured fact.[1] If this be so there can be no difficulty whatsoever in finding room for the Pastorals within St. Paul's lifetime. The further objection that the situation presumed in the Epistles is too artificial to be true to fact might be urged against 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians, in both of which the Apostle enters into considerable detail, although he proposes to visit the Churches concerned very shortly.

It will be convenient at this point to notice Vernon Bartlet's contribution to the discussion of our problem in the shape of several articles on "The Historic Setting of the Pastoral Epistles" in the *Expositor*, viii. 3.

He sets himself three questions to answer with regard to the Pastorals:

1. Is the style and diction consistent with Pauline authorship?

2. Is their religion Pauline or not?

3. Can situations be found for them within the known life of the Apostle?

He finds nothing in the style or diction which in any way precludes the Pauline authorship, and is of opinion that the special teaching contained in the Epistles is to be explained by the fact that they are Pauline "Pastorals" and must be judged as Pastorals. It is, however, his answer to the third question that

[1] Harnack, *Date of Acts and Synoptic Gospels*, p. 103.

is particularly interesting and suggestive, and it is in this connection that his articles are likely to provoke discussion.

Dr. Bartlet is a strong advocate of the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, and is at the same time sincerely convinced that the Apostle's appeal to Caesar failed and that he suffered the extreme penalty of the law at the close of the first imprisonment. His solution, therefore, differs from that of the majority of those who favour the Pauline authorship inasmuch as they assume a release and a second imprisonment. Now we have already noted the fact that the release of St. Paul after the first imprisonment is strenuously denied by a large body of critics, and that this denial has considerably influenced their attitude towards the Pastoral Epistles. A solution, therefore, which claims to find room for these letters within the limits of the Apostle's career, *as set forth in the Acts*, cuts at the root of a large measure of hostile criticism and is worthy of careful consideration.

The sequence of events suggested by Bartlet is somewhat as follows :

1 Timothy was evidently written at a time during the Roman imprisonment when the Apostle was optimistic as to the speedy settlement of the appeal in his own favour, and this could only have been at the very beginning of his stay at Rome, when he was supported by the thought of the character of the hearing at Caesarea, and more especially by the opinion expressed by Herod Agrippa that he might have been set free if he had not appealed to Caesar. With this assumption as the basis of his scheme Bartlet proceeds to place the so-called " Epistles of the Imprisonment " in the following order :

(1) They were all written at a relatively early stage in the two years before St. Paul's appeal was decided against him.

(2) Philemon, Colossians, and probably Ephesians date from the first half of this period, while Philippians represents a later stage.

(3) 1 Timothy and Titus belong to the earliest stage of St. Paul's stay in Rome, and are earlier than the letter to Philemon for two reasons:

a. Because Timothy is already at Rome when the latter was written.

b. Tychicus, who is to be the bearer of the latter, is named in Titus iii. as one of the two possible substitutes for Titus at his post in Crete.

He suggests that Timothy had already started from Ephesus to Rome before the first letter reached him, and that he and the letter "crossed" on the way between Ephesus and Rome. This would be in the early summer of 60 A.D. Timothy then remained at Rome until the following year, and was sent back to Ephesus before the winter of 61. Early in St. Paul's third year at Rome, when the outlook was beginning to darken and it became necessary for the Apostle to set his house in order, he writes again to Timothy, who of all his helpers occupied the most responsible post, bidding him hasten to Rome to his side "before winter." Whether Timothy reached the Apostle before the end came in the winter of 62 we have no means of knowing.

If we are agreed that the style, diction, and teaching of the Epistles are adequately explained by the fact that they are "Pastorals," there would seem to be no great difficulty in accepting this solution. I imagine, however, that it will meet with serious

opposition from those who argue that they show a considerable advance both in language and doctrine upon Colossians and Ephesians, and that it is, therefore, impossible to place them before these latter Epistles in point of time.

(*d*) *The Vocabulary of the Epistles.*—Great stress is laid, as we have seen, upon the large number of new words and phrases in the Epistles as betokening a non-Pauline origin. It is right, however, to point out that they have, in respect of language, many coincidences with Philippians, the Epistle which in the opinion of most scholars stands nearest to them in point of time. They also contain striking resemblances to other literature connected with Ephesus, as *e.g.* the Address to the Elders at Miletus, Ephesians, and the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. The new features in language and style, which are undoubtedly found in the letters, are due in some degree to their special aim and purpose, and to the peculiar conditions that they were framed to meet. The situation is no longer that which produced the early letters, and new questions have arisen which call for a solution. The days of the great Pauline controversies are past, and the present needs of the Church demand new remedies and require a treatment for which as yet no occasion had been provided. "The marked change of language and the number of new words which the Pastoral Epistles exhibit is due to the fact that St. Paul had to create a new terminology to correspond with the new ecclesiastical situation with which he found himself confronted. Many of the new words are the brief expression of something which in his earlier Epistles he describes as a process, but which had now become so common

a phenomenon in the practical management of a congregation that it demanded a special name, *e.g.* ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, 'to teach a different doctrine' (1 Tim. i. 3), whose occurrence to describe a danger that had become very pressing in the early Church is not only not 'un-Pauline' but is thoroughly true to St. Paul's mind and character." [1]

The Latinisms, which occur with moderate frequency, may be the result of the influence of the long sojourn at Rome upon the Apostle's language. Little importance can be attached to the plea that the letters have a style all their own because they are addressed to individuals and not to communities, seeing that when St. Paul writes to Philemon he still retains his old familiar style.

The Use of an Amanuensis and the Art of "Shorthand," and their Influence upon Vocabulary and Style.— The reader will have noticed that questions of language and style play a most important part in the discussion of the authenticity of the Pauline letters, and that considerable emphasis is laid upon differences in this direction between the acknowledged and doubtful letters in coming to a decision as to the genuineness or non-genuineness of the latter. It may be useful, therefore, at this point to draw attention to a factor upon which recent research has thrown some light, which may eventually prove to have considerable effect upon criticism based upon the language and style of the various Epistles. The use of an amanuensis by St. Paul in the composition of the majority of his letters is a fact which calls for no special comment here, but the further question as to what extent the diction of the Epistles may have been influenced

[1] Ramsay, *Expositor*, vii. 7, p. 488.

by the stage of culture which the particular amanuensis may have reached, and what amount of freedom he may have been allowed by the Apostle in the actual composition of the letters, has only recently received the attention it deserves. We certainly find suggestions thrown out here and there as to the possible influence of the amanuensis upon the language and form of the Pauline letters. Thus Dr. Armitage Robinson, speaking at the Church Congress at Swansea in 1907, remarked : " The Pastorals leave us wondering how much Paul actually dictated . . . and how far he may have given general directions." [1] Sanday also touched upon the question in his *Bampton Lectures*, where he states : " I have sometimes asked myself whether the relation of the Ephesians to other Epistles may not be due to the degree of expertness attained by the scribe in the art of shorthand. This art was very largely practised, and Paul's amanuenses may have had recourse to it somewhat frequently. One might take down words *verbatim*, then we get a vivid, broken, natural style like that of Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians. Another might not succeed in getting down the exact words, and thus when he came to work up his notes into a fair copy, the structure of the sentences would be his own, and it might naturally seem more laboured." [2] But we have had to wait for the appearance of Milligan's *New Testament Documents* for an adequate treatment of this subject. We have here another illustration of the value of the recent discovery and study of the papyri in connection with the New Testament, and Milligan devotes a special and lengthy note in his

[1] *Church Congress Official Report*, 1907, p. 319.
[2] Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 342.

volume to the elucidation of the subject from this particular point of view.[1]

Speaking of "Dictation and Shorthand" he tells us that there is no direct evidence that Paul's amanuenses fell back upon a system of shorthand, but that it is not unreasonable to conjecture that they might have done so in accordance with an established custom in similar circumstances. There is sufficient evidence to show that certain forms of shorthand or contracted writing were in vogue, tending to greater ease and rapidity in the recording of a spoken or dictated message. As long ago as 1884 a Greek inscription belonging to the fourth century B.C. was discovered at Athens, which describes how certain vowels and consonants can be expressed by strokes placed in various positions. But the evidence here is not decisive as to the use of shorthand, as the description might mean that nothing more than a contracted form of writing was intended. Milligan suggests that there may be a reference to the practice in the LXX version of Psalm xlv. 1, *κάλαμος γραμματέως ὀξυγράφου* (the pen of a ready writer).

Undoubted evidence of the use of shorthand is, however, forthcoming in the Oxyrhynchus papyri published by Grenfell and Hunt, among which is found an interesting contract proving that scribes and clerks were often prepared for their work by regular training in shorthand. This reference to the use of the art of shorthand is also supported by actual specimens of the symbols employed in it which have been recovered, one of which, belonging to the year 104 B.C., is now preserved at Leyden. The use of shorthand among the Romans is referred to by the

[1] Milligan, *New Testament Documents*, pp. 241-247.

younger Pliny and Plutarch, and the introduction of the practice is attributed to Cicero.

It is by no means inconceivable, therefore, that a simple explanation of some of the peculiarities of style and language in the Pauline writings may be found in the practice of dictation accompanied by the use of shorthand. If this is so, the arguments that are so frequently adduced to disprove the Pauline authorship of a particular letter or group of letters on the score of linguistic differences and difficulties may prove to be based on very insecure foundations.

(*e*) *Heresies and Church Organisation in the Epistles.*—There are still two points which we have to notice before we close our discussion of the objections to the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals.

(1) *Heresies.*—There would seem to be nothing in the references to heresies and false teaching in the letters which need be exclusively connected with second-century Gnosticism. Hort [1] has clearly shown that the errors which are condemned here are not related to later Gnosticism at all, but are purely Judaistic in character and were in existence in the earlier half of the first century.

(2) *Church Organisation and Government.*—The details of Church order and government in the Epistles are markedly vague, and there is a lack of definiteness connected with them which speaks of a stage of early development. The organisation is still in a fluid state, which is not in accord with second-century conditions, when the constitution of the Church was to a considerable extent stereotyped. The whole picture of the Church is far less developed than that found in the Ignatian Epistles, and it is by no means

[1] Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 133-140.

impossible that the Church at Ephesus, which had been established at least fourteen years before the Apostle's death, should have reached the stage depicted in these Epistles before that event took place.

Summary.—The Pastorals undoubtedly represent an advance upon the earlier Pauline Epistles, an advance with respect to language, Church organisation, Christian teaching, and the type of heresy combated. On the other hand the gap between these Epistles and the earlier Pauline literature is not so well defined as that which separates them from the literature of the second century. Again, the striking emphasis on organisation, teaching, authority, and loyalty, and the very significant fact that it is St. Paul's authority and not his personality that is prominent throughout the letters, make it difficult to bring them within the Apostle's lifetime. On the whole, after a close study of the case against the Pauline authorship, and after carefully weighing the evidence on both sides, I am inclined to return the Scotch verdict of "Not proven," and am content to leave the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles as a problem that still remains unsolved.

Pseudonymity in connection with Christian Literature.—I will close this chapter with a brief reference to the assumption which underlies a great deal of the criticism that we have been discussing, viz. that some of the Pauline letters are the work of writers who deliberately published them under the name of the Apostle with a view of strengthening their appeal to the Church and of gaining additional support for their teaching by such a procedure. At first sight the very suggestion that men who were capable of

writing letters, every word of which proves them to have been men of the deepest Christian piety and thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Christ, could have been guilty of such conduct brings a shock to the moral sense. And yet the procedure is not so unthinkable as we might imagine it to be. It is an undoubted fact that the centuries preceding and following the rise of Christianity were marked by a fairly extensive use of the pseudepigraphic method in philosophy, religion, and literature. The best known instances of the practice are afforded by the Apocalypses of later Judaism, which in almost every case were issued under the name of one of the Old Testament heroes or prophets, such as Moses, Enoch, Isaiah, or Daniel.[1]

In Greek and Roman literature it was the recognised custom among the very greatest writers to introduce rhetorical speeches which were never delivered into their historical works, and the practice was ultimately extended to letters and lengthy treatises. Dr. Moffatt tells us that to write a letter under Paul's name was for a Paulinist a perfectly legitimate literary artifice, breathing not a crude endeavour to deceive, but self-effacement and deep religious motives.[2] Sir W. M. Ramsay, an even greater authority on St. Paul than Dr. Moffatt, suggests that Christian opinion may have raised the standard in this direction, and strongly believes that it would have condemned, and did actually condemn, any attempt seriously to mould public opinion and affect Church teaching under a false assumption of Apostolic authority.[3]

[1] See p. 91.

[2] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 40 f., and *Ency. Bibl.* vol. iv. col. 5095.

[3] *Expositor*, vii. 2. p. 92.

Conclusion.—The main result of our discussion has been to establish the fact that out of thirteen Epistles traditionally attributed to St. Paul we may accept eight as being genuine beyond any serious dispute. Of the remaining five there is still an appreciable amount of hesitation felt with regard to 2 Thessalonians and Ephesians, a hesitation for which we failed to discover adequate grounds. The authorship of the Pastoral Epistles must still be regarded as a problem which has not yet been satisfactorily solved. The position of the Pauline Epistles in the critical world of to-day is one which affords the deepest gratification, and is a fact of the most far-reaching importance. It implies that the very earliest of the documents of Christianity are authentic and genuine, and that all that we read and learn in them concerning our Lord, His Person, teaching, life, death, and resurrection comes to us certified and warranted by one who himself lived and wrote before the generation to which our Saviour belonged had passed away. Twentieth-century criticism has then restored to the Christian Church an inheritance that is priceless in value.

CHAPTER IV

THE NON-PAULINE EPISTLES

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

Literature for Chapter IV.

G. Milligan, *The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.* 1899.

Harnack, *Z.N.T.W.* 1900. S. 16-41, "Probabilia über die Adresse und den Verfasser des Hebräerbriefs."

Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* Third edition. 1903.

Ramsay, *St. Luke the Physician.* 1908.

Wickham, *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* 1910.

M. Dods, "The Epistle to the Hebrews" (*Expositor's Greek Testament*). 1910.

A. Nairne, *The Epistle of Priesthood.* 1913.

The following papers in the *Expositor*:

Ramsay, "The Date and Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews," v. 9. p. 401 f.

G. Milligan, "The Roman Destination of the Epistle to the Hebrews," vi. 4. p. 437 f.

Vernon Bartlet, "Barnabas and his Genuine Epistle."

"The Epistle to the Hebrews as the Work of Barnabas."

"More Words on the Epistle to the Hebrews."

"The Riddle of the Epistle to the Hebrews," vi. 5. p. 409 f., 6. p. 28 f., 8. p. 381 f., 11. p. 431 f., viii. 5. p. 548 f.

J. Dickie, "The Literary Riddle of the Epistle to the Hebrews," viii. 5. p. 371 f.

A. E. Eagar, "The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews," vi. 10. pp. 74 f., 110 f.

Articles on "The Epistle to the Hebrews" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (A. B. Bruce), and in *Encyclopædia Biblica* (H. von Soden).

Recent criticism has devoted itself with much assiduity to the study of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and yet it can hardly be said that anything like a general agreement upon any one of the crucial points has been reached. The widest variety of opinion

still exists with regard to its author, its destination, the nationality of its recipients, and its date. This chapter can, therefore, be little more than a chronicle of the many theories that have been, and are being, suggested in connection with the Epistle, although an attempt will be made to indicate the lines along which finality of opinion is likely to be attained.

I. The Character and Style of the Epistle.—The Epistle is distinguished from all other letters in the New Testament by the fact that no address is prefixed to it, although its concluding paragraph is couched in formal epistolary terms. The omission of the address has been accounted for in a variety of ways by different scholars. Some maintain that the Epistle must have opened with an address which has been accidentally lost, or deliberately suppressed, while others argue that the Epistle was originally issued in its extant form. The deliberate suppression of the address is explained by Harnack as being due to the Epistle having come from the hand of a woman, Prisca, a fact which the early Church, in its prejudice against women, was anxious should be forgotten as speedily as possible. Others account for the omission on the ground that the Epistle was intended for a comparatively small and insignificant Christian community, in which case the address may have been contained in some private accompanying letter, or conveyed by the bearer of the Epistle.[1] Another suggestion is that it was omitted, not because of the sex of the writer, but because the character of the community addressed, which perhaps proved faithless in the time of trial, made it desirable that the original destination should not be too carefully preserved.

[1] Milligan, *Expositor*, vi. 4. p. 439.

The simplest and the most probable theory is that the Epistle was issued without the customary greeting. This has led some scholars to doubt whether the Epistle was originally meant to be a letter at all. Wrede,[1] *e.g.*, regards it as a treatise meant for Christendom as a whole, which was afterwards thrown into the shape of a Pauline letter by the addition of the concluding paragraph, which is nothing more than a cento of Pauline phrases. Deissmann[2] again describes it as a literary Epistle, with no special destination or purpose, whose contents are mainly intended for publicity. The Epistle, however, although not strictly epistolary in form, is undoubtedly a genuine letter. It is addressed to a specific group of Christians by some one who knew them and was keenly interested in their situation, and was perhaps one of themselves. He speaks unmistakably in tones of affection, and there are many references, personal, local, and temporal, which the writer takes for granted will be intelligible to his readers. Criticism of this Epistle is pleasantly free from any attempts to find divisions, interpolations, or sources in the document, beyond the single suggestion that the concluding epilogue may have been a later addition. The Epistle is universally recognised as a well-rounded and complete whole, executed on a well-conceived plan, governed throughout by one single idea, and devoted to one purpose which is never allowed to drop out of sight.

Style.—As far back as the time of Origen the style of the Epistle, as compared with the rest of the New Testament, attracted attention. It is unique in its approach to the literary style of the Graeco-Roman

[1] Wrede, *T. und U.* xxxv. 3. 109.
[2] Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 243.

period, and occasionally rises to the heights of the best models of the classical age. In some ways it may be compared to Greek rhetorical prose, although it is too much to claim for it, as von Soden[1] does, that it is constituted in accordance with the rules of later Greek rhetoric. That the author is a conscious stylist is demonstrated by the artistic structure of the Epistle, the careful finish of every sentence, the exact balance of every period, and the orderly plan which dominates the whole work. The writer never allows the rush of emotion, or the course of his argument to interfere with the exigencies of grammar and style, as is so frequently the case in the Pauline letters. In the words of Deissmann:[2] "In the Epistle to the Hebrews Christianity has moved from its native stratum and is seeking to acquire culture." The author also shows closer acquaintance with the language of Greek philosophy, from Plato and Aristotle to Philo, than is usual among New Testament writers, and the Epistle is studded with technical terms and phrases employed by philosophers, such as *αἰσθητήριον*, *δημιουργός*, *θέλησις*, *μετριοπαθεῖν*, *τιμωρία*, *ὑπόδειγμα*. Its theological standpoint is midway between that of the Pauline letters on the one hand and the Fourth Gospel on the other. The influence of Alexandrian methods of thought is beginning to make itself felt in Christian literature, but not to the extent that is manifested in the later Johannine writings.

II. The Author of the Epistle.—The theory of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle, which seems to have originated in Alexandria early in the third

[1] Von Soden, *Ency. Bibl.* vol. ii. col. 2000.
[2] Deissman, *op. cit.* p. 243.

century in spite of considerable hesitation on the part of Clement and Origen, and which eventually swayed the Christian Church until the days of the Renaissance, is now frankly abandoned by every modern scholar. The style, personality, and theology of the writer differ so radically from all that we know of St. Paul that it is no longer possible to associate him with the direct composition of the Epistle.

Failing St. Paul himself a large number of scholars are driven to seek for the author among the known members of the Pauline circle, such as Barnabas, Luke, Apollos, Philip the Deacon, Prisca, and Aquila. Of these the first two were connected with the Epistle by ancient tradition, Barnabas being designated as the author by Tertullian (*De pudic.* xx.), and Luke suggested as the translator of an original Pauline Aramaic letter by Clement of Alexandria.

Barnabas.—If we are to find the author of Hebrews among the friends and companions of St. Paul, there is much to be said on behalf of Barnabas. Besides the confident ascription of the Epistle to him by Tertullian, there is further evidence in the same direction found in the newly discovered *Tractatus Origenis de libris S. Scripturarum*, where Heb. xiii. 15 is quoted as a word of "sanctissimus Barnabas." His personal history and character are also decidedly in favour of the presumption. He is traditionally described as one of the Seventy, and if this tradition is founded on fact he would have had the fullest privilege of personal connection with the Master without being actually one of the Apostles. He was closely associated with St. Paul, and was in some ways responsible for his subsequent career as the Apostle of the Gentiles. His personality would

appeal with considerable force to Jewish Christians, who would probably regard him as a wiser and a greater man than St. Paul. Then again he was a Hellenist, and a Hellenist of Cyprus, and, therefore, well within the range of Alexandrian training and modes of thinking, and at the same time a Levite, with a hereditary interest in the Jewish sacrificial system. The combination of the Hellenist with the Levite would go some way towards explaining the blend of idealism and realism which is so characteristic a feature in the Epistle. Finally the λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως of xiii. 22 is strongly suggestive of the υἱὸς παρακλήσεως of Acts iv. 36. There would seem to be, however, some very serious difficulties in the way of identifying Barnabas with the author of Hebrews.

1. His original contact with the Gospel was more direct than is implied in ii. 3, if the expression " was confirmed unto us by them that heard them " is taken to refer to both writer and readers.

2. If Barnabas was the author how is the rise of the Pauline tradition to be accounted for ?

St. Luke.—St. Luke's connection with the Epistle was confined in ancient tradition to collaboration with St. Paul, either as his translator or interpreter, but some modern scholars show a tendency to attribute the entire authorship to him. A very strenuous plea for the Lucan authorship is entered by Dr. A. E. Eagar in the *Expositor*, vi. 10. pp. 74 f., 110 f. He urges that all that can be said in favour of the Pauline authorship is equally applicable to St. Luke, while, at the same time, the Lucan hypothesis is free from the objections which make it impossible to regard the Apostle as the author. He then proceeds to show that there is a very close connection both as to

language, style, and matter between our Epistle and the Lucan writings in the New Testament. He supports this contention by reference to the large number of philosophical, medical, and technical terms which are common to the Third Gospel, Acts and Hebrews, words showing a distinct acquaintance with the works of Plato, Aristotle, Hippocrates, Thucydides, and Aristophanes. In the realm of thought and matter he compares the story of the Childhood in St. Luke with the tenor of the Epistle as a whole, and sees in the OX, which is the emblem of this Gospel, a recognition of the Lucan representation of our Lord as Priest and Victim, this being also a leading idea in Hebrews. Finally he emphasises the prominence given to the purpose of the calling of the Gentiles in the Gospel. This becomes the governing thought in Acts, and is worked out to its logical conclusion in Hebrews, which thus becomes the third book of a series devoted throughout to the unfolding of one great conception, the merging of Judaism in a universal Church.

There is much that is attractive in this hypothesis. It goes far towards explaining the cultured style and Pauline affinities in the Epistle, and is supported to some extent by tradition. But the literary relationship is hardly close enough to warrant the conclusion based upon it. There are only about six words which are peculiar to our Epistle and the Third Gospel, and only six peculiar to Hebrews and Acts, while there are two which occur in all three books, a very inadequate foundation on which to build the Lucan authorship of Hebrews.[1] But even if the literary affinities were more definite, it is difficult to imagine

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 436.

15652

a Gentile like St. Luke writing an Epistle which is so essentially Jewish in tone as Hebrews. It is perhaps not inconceivable that a Christian Gentile of the first century should have become so impregnated with the spirit of the Old Testament and so familiarised with Jewish thought and habits as is manifestly the case with the author of Hebrews, but it is highly improbable. The presumption that the writer of the Epistle was a Jew by race is almost universally acknowledged, and this alone rules out the Lucan hypothesis. Again it is not easy to understand how one and the same writer could have written two accounts of the Agony in the Garden which differ so radically from each other as those which are found in St. Luke's Gospel and this Epistle respectively (cf. St. Luke xxii. 39-46 with Heb. v. 7 f.).

Apollos.—The name of Apollos, in spite of the fact that there is much in the Epistle that suits his character admirably, was, strangely enough, never associated with it in the early Church, and it remained for Luther to be the first to suggest him as the probable author. A Jew by birth, an Alexandrian by training, "an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures," a friend and pupil of St. Paul and acquainted with Timothy, he seems to fill the rôle of the writer of the Epistle admirably. Nevertheless it is not easy to understand how tradition could have preserved absolute silence regarding him if he had any real connection with the Epistle.

Philip the Deacon.—An interesting suggestion is that of the Rev. W. M. Lewis, adopted afterwards by Ramsay,[1] which attributes the Epistle to Philip the Deacon, and the place of writing to Caesarea. Accord-

[1] Ramsay, *Expositor*, v. 9. p. 407 f.; *Luke the Physician*, p. 301 f.

ing to this theory the Epistle was written after consultation with St. Paul, then a prisoner in that city, in order to reconcile the Judaistic party in the Church at Jerusalem or in Palestine, the concluding paragraph being added by Paul himself. The hypothesis commended itself to Bishop E. L. Hicks,[1] with the exception of the last portion of it which attributed the epilogue to St. Paul. He strongly supported it on the ground of the striking linguistic affinities between our Epistle and Colossians and Ephesians which he dated from Caesarea. This is a serious and praiseworthy attempt to fit the Epistle into a convincing historical situation; but it must be decisively rejected, and for two reasons.

(1) It is now proved beyond all doubt, as we shall see later,[2] that the Epistle was never addressed to Jerusalem or to Palestinian Churches. (2) There are no indications whatsoever in the Epistle of any such cleavage as this hypothesis demands. The great Pauline controversy is not even on the horizon, and there is not the slightest hint that Judaic and Gentile Christians were, or even could be, regarded from different standpoints. The writer of the Epistle is a universalist who has travelled far beyond the days when the Gentile had to wage a hard struggle before he attained to a position of equality with the Jew in the Christian Church.

Prisca and Aquila.—The most recent theory as to the authorship comes from Harnack,[3] and is accepted by Rendel Harris and Moulton. He attributes the Epistle to Prisca and Aquila, but assigns the more important part in its composition to the

[1] Hicks, *Interpreter*, April 1909. [2] See pp. 306-311.
[3] Harnack, *Z.N.T.W.*, 1900, S. 16-41.

woman. Aquila's name had been suggested before by Alford, but Harnack is the first to see the signs of a woman's hand in the book. He maintains that a duplicate authorship is implied by the occasional change of the first person singular into a plural, and *vice versa*, and explains the omission of the customary address in the letter as being due to deliberate suppression on the part of the early Church because it emanated in part from a woman. That Prisca had undoubted gifts for teaching he proves from Acts xviii. 26, *καὶ ἀκριβέστερον αὐτῷ ἐξέθεντο τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁδόν.*

Finally, it fits in with the suggestion, which now commends itself to the majority of scholars, that the Epistle was addressed to a "House-Church" in Rome, because Romans xvi. 5 shows that Prisca and Aquila were closely connected with such a "House-Church." The hypothesis is worked out with all the thoroughness and enthusiasm that are so characteristic of Harnack, but it fails to be quite convincing. It is not easy to imagine a woman, who was also an intimate friend of St. Paul, taking upon herself the writing of an Epistle of this character, even if she had the requisite ability. The teaching recorded in Acts xviii. 26 is confined to instruction of a private character, and stands on an entirely different plane from the public teaching implied in the authorship of Hebrews. The internal evidence of the Epistle is on the whole against any such supposition. A woman would have mentioned Deborah rather than Barak in xi. 32, and the masculine participle *διηγούμενον* in the same verse would seem to settle the matter conclusively. Harnack, however, maintains that a feminine participle stood here in the original

text, and that the same influence which brought about the suppression of the address also changed the gender of this participle.

One name outside the Pauline circle has been put forward by Dom. Chapman,[1] viz. Aristion.

Aristion.—In a tenth-century MS. of the Gospels discovered by F. C. Conybeare the last twelve verses of St. Mark are attributed, in a rubric which heads them, to a certain Ariston Presbyter, whom Chapman identifies with the Aristion of Papias.[2] He then claims to find a certain specific type of thought which is common to the teaching of Aristion and his circle as quoted by Irenaeus, the concluding section of St. Mark, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Out of this rather flimsy material he builds up his theory that Aristion must have been the author of our Epistle.

A survey of these many hypotheses only serves to reveal the fact that as far as the authorship of Hebrews is concerned we are still in the realm of conjecture. While many of the suggestions are attractive and possible, no theory is absolutely convincing. I am not quite clear in my own mind whether the field of selection has not been unduly restricted by criticism as a whole, and that in two directions.

1. Is it essential to confine the writer of the Epistle to the Pauline circle? The book itself is decidedly un-Pauline in every material aspect, and if it were not for the reference to Timothy it is doubtful whether it would ever have been associated with the Apostle's entourage.

[1] Chapman, *Revue Bénédictine* (1905), p. 50 f.

[2] It should be noted that this identification had already been made by Conybeare in his article in the *Expositor*, iv. 8. p. 245. It is also accepted by Swete, who prints a facsimile of this fragment. See *St. Mark*, p. cxi.

2. Is it necessary to interpret ii. 3 as referring to the writer as well as to the readers of the Epistle, and thus insist that the author could not have been a hearer of Jesus? It is quite possible that we have in this passage only another instance of the literary convention whereby a writer simply identifies himself with his readers without any further implication.

III. Destination and Purpose of the Epistle. —The title πρὸς Ἑβραίους is not an integral part of the Epistle and was not attached to it until some time well on in the second century. All definite knowledge of the actual author and of the original recipients had been lost, and the title simply represents the impression left upon the mind of the early Church by the special character of its contents. The data for the reconstruction of the situation implied in the Epistle are very scanty. The community addressed owed its conversion not to our Lord Himself, nor apparently to His Apostles, but to teachers who are described generally as "those who had heard" (ii. 3). In the first stages of its history the progress of its members had been highly satisfactory (vi. 10, 11), and they had endured persecution with firmness and patience (x. 32). Some considerable time had now elapsed since they were first evangelised, and some of their leaders were dead (xiii. 7). In these latter days alarming signs had begun to show themselves, and a state of distress and danger had arisen, in which the most prominent feature was a great lack of zeal which threatened to destroy their Christian faith. The letter was, therefore, written to strengthen those who were becoming indolent and languid, and who through faint-heartedness and lukewarmness were in danger of losing all.

Now from the earliest days of its history the Epistle has been universally regarded as written for the benefit of Jewish Christians, who were in danger of abandoning their Christian faith and of apostatising to Judaism. In recent years, however, opinion has changed completely as to the latter point, and it is now fairly generally agreed that the danger which threatened the Church addressed in the Epistle was not a mere reversion to Judaism, but an absolute and entire shipwreck of its religious life. Again a very weighty minority of scholars, such as Harnack, Schürer, Weizsäcker, von Soden, M'Giffert, and Moffatt, hold that, if any definite nationality at all is indicated in the Epistle, the evidence points in the direction of Gentile rather than Jewish Christians. *Primâ facie* this would appear to be a somewhat strange conclusion to come to, and it seems to be contradicted by the whole tenor of the Epistle. Phrases like "the fathers," "the seed of Abraham," "the people," "the people of God," seem to point decisively to the Jewish descent of the readers, and yet the usage in the Pauline letters, where exactly similar language is applied to Gentile Christians, shows that this type of phraseology is not conclusive. Again the use of the Old Testament throughout the Epistle and the fact that the argument is entirely based on the Jewish Scriptures, both of which would appeal with remarkable force to the heirs of the Old Covenant, are not easily explained on the contrary assumption. To the Gentile the Old Testament meant nothing apart from Christianity, and any value that he attached to the Jewish Scriptures and to Judaism generally was due simply to the light thrown by Christianity upon them. To the Jew,

on the other hand, the Old Testament was absolutely authoritative in itself, quite independently of his acceptance of the Christian faith, and any argument, such as that employed in this Epistle, derived exclusively from the Scriptures of the Old Covenant, had the strongest claim upon his intellect and conscience. On general grounds, at any rate, the presumption is greatly in favour of the Jewish descent of those for whom the Epistle was intended. The argument in favour of Gentile readers is, nevertheless, pressed with much cogency. The main point adduced in support of this position is connected with vi. 1, where it is urged that the reference to "first principles," "dead works," and "faith towards God" is very much more intelligible in the case of Gentiles, who had been converted from paganism and idolatry, than of Jews who had been trained and nourished in the fear of God. It is also maintained that the phrase "to serve the living God" in ix. 14 suggests a contrast with pagan idols, and that the usage of the phrase elsewhere in the New Testament, as *e.g.* in St. Paul's speech at Lystra, "that ye should turn from these vain things unto the living God" (Acts xiv. 15), and in 1 Thess. i. 9, "Ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God," invariably points to a Gentile audience. Furthermore, the moral exhortations in the Epistle are claimed to be more appropriate if directed against those who had been recently converted from paganism, and the Epistle is said to contain undoubted references to pagan cults.

When confronted with what is after all the chief difficulty connected with this theory, viz. how to explain why an Epistle which is concerned exclusively with the respective merits of Christianity and the

Levitical system came to be written to Gentile Christians, we are told by these scholars that there was a type of Gentile Christianity existing of an eclectic and syncretistic character which was so much concerned with Judaistic thought and customs as to endanger the Christian faith. Moffatt [1] suggests that the situation of the Church or company of Christians addressed here possibly included certain temptations of a specifically Jewish cast, which might appeal especially to Christians who from some religious idiosyncrasy were nourishing their faith upon the Levitical portions of the Old Testament Scriptures, and that it is conceivable that these seductive tendencies were the result of a speculative Judaism which, allied to certain ritualistic and sacerdotal proclivities (similar to those controverted in Romans and Colossians), was besetting Gentile Christians, or even Christians who had been thrown into contact with Judaism during the second decade after the fall of Jerusalem. "The morality and monotheism preached by Hellenistic Jews especially must have proved not simply a rival to Christianity in the eyes of many pagans but a source of dangerous fascination for weaker and less intelligent members of the Christian Church, who lay open through birth or associations to some Jewish influences. Several hints in this Epistle may be held to indicate the presence of the peril (vi. 6, xiii. 9-16)."

Dr. Moffatt's language in the paragraph quoted and the recurrence of the words "perhaps," "possibly," "conceivably," show that he feels none too sure of his ground with reference to this particular point. The theory as a whole is evidently as yet

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 449 f.

only in the tentative stage, and we need more positive information as to the influence of Jewish ideals upon Gentile Christendom before it can be said to be established. The whole atmosphere of the Epistle is so impregnated with Judaism that it requires more convincing arguments than any that have been hitherto adduced to justify us in abandoning the continuous tradition of seventeen centuries, which saw in the Epistle to the Hebrews a " word of consolation " for Jewish Christians. We have already pointed out that the Epistle shows the clearest signs of a definite destination. It was addressed, not to Jewish Christians generally, but to Jewish Christians as forming some particular community or Church.

It now remains for us to learn something of the character of this Church, and, if possible, to locate it. The absence of any traces of differences of circumstances or opinion among the readers of the Epistle renders it more than probable that the community to which it was addressed was composed of a comparatively small number of members, and that the readers formed a body which was homogeneous in feeling and position.

There are no signs of any such divisions or cleavages as the Epistles to the Corinthians and Romans bear witness to in the Churches of Corinth and Rome respectively. But the community, although small in numbers, was not a mere section or party inside a larger Church. There is no indication whatsoever of any such subordination to a Mother Church. What we have to imagine here is a small, but independent, Christian community, with special characteristics and special dangers of its own, living its own life, and perhaps one among many communities

similarly situated. It is now suggested, and the suggestion has met with a chorus of approval, that such a community is to be found in the "House-Church" which the Pauline Epistles show to have been a not uncommon feature of primitive Christian organisation.

The further question now arises, Where was this "House-Church" located? The abandonment of the view that the Epistle was written to warn Jewish Christians against apostasy to Judaism and the recognition of the fact that the main argument of the Epistle is concerned not with the Temple-ritual, but with the Tabernacle-worship as outlined in the LXX, have made it unnecessary to confine the destination of the Epistle to Jerusalem or Alexandria, the only two places which were under the direct influence of Temple-worship. Modern opinion is rapidly coming round to the view that a "House-Church" at Rome best satisfies all the conditions of the problem. Romans xvi. supplies abundant evidence of the existence of such "House-Churches" at Rome, one of which is connected with the names of Prisca and Aquila, in whom Harnack finds the possible authors of the Epistle. The Jewish element in the Roman Church is also known to have been particularly strong, and among the Jewish Christians in the Imperial city there were doubtless some who owed their Christianity to the "sojourners from Rome, both Jews and proselytes," who were converted in Jerusalem at the first Pentecost. A community of primitive Jewish Christians, whose acquaintance with Christianity was somewhat imperfect, and who had experienced but little of the influence of St. Paul, answers almost exactly to the impression that the

Epistle gives us of the character and identity of its readers. In further support of the correctness of this suggestion it may be noted that the Epistle was well known in Rome before the end of the first century; that the Roman Church was much given to liberality, a point frequently emphasised in the Epistle; and that the persecutions mentioned in the Epistle as already endured or impending are fully explained by the various attacks made on Christians in Rome by Nero and Domitian.[1]

IV. Date of the Epistle.—The change of view with respect to the purpose and destination of the Epistle has had a corresponding effect upon modern opinion regarding the date of the Epistle. As long as it was felt necessary to consider the Epistle as a warning to Jewish Christians resident in Jerusalem against apostasy to Judaism, it was natural to connect it with the period of deepening gloom which preceded the final catastrophe in A.D. 70, and to date the Epistle from the seventh decade of the first century. It is evident from the whole trend of the argument that the writer had not in view the Temple-cultus as it existed before the destruction of Jerusalem. It is the worship of the Tabernacle, and not any living system, that engrosses his attention, and his knowledge is manifestly derived from literature and not from actual contact with the Levitical ritual. The modern tendency is, therefore, to place the Epistle within approximate distance of the Domitianic period. The use of the Epistle by Clement of Rome fixes the *terminus ad quem*, while the reference to Timothy makes a date much later than A.D. 80

[1] The argument for the Roman destination of the Epistle will be found set forth with much clearness in the *Expositor*, vi. 4. p. 437 f. (Milligan).

improbable. The Epistle shows signs of acquaintance with some of the Pauline Epistles, especially with Galatians and Romans, and perhaps also with 1 St. Peter. A date between A.D. 80 and 85 is, therefore, a reasonable conjecture, in which case the crisis impending over the community, which is foreshadowed in the Epistle, would be identified with the persecution in the reign of Domitian.

CHAPTER V

THE NON-PAULINE EPISTLES (*contd.*)

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES

LITERATURE FOR CHAPTERS V., VI., AND VII.

The Epistle of St. James, F. J. A. Hort. 1909. (Chaps. i.–iv. 7).
„ „ W. E. Oesterley. 1910. (*Exp. Greek Testament.*)
„ „ J. B. Mayor. Third edition. 1913.
„ „ H. von Soden, (*Hand-Kommentar zum N T.*). 1899.
1 *St. Peter*, F. J. A. Hort. 1898. (Chaps. i.–ii. 17.)
„ C. Bigg (*Int. Crit. Comm.*). 1902.
„ J. H. A. Hart. 1910. (*Exp. Greek Testament.*)
„ H. von Soden (*H.C. zum N.T.*). 1896.
2 *St. Peter and St. Jude*, C. Bigg. 1902.
„ „ J. B. Mayor. 1907.
„ „ R. H. Strachan. 1910. (*E.G.T.*)
„ „ H. von Soden (*H.C. zum N.T.*). 1899.
E. G. Hardy, *Christianity and the Roman Empire.* 1894.
H. B. Workman, *Persecution in the Early Church.* 1906.
Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire.* 1897.
Articles in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*: "The Epistle of St. James" by J. B. Mayor, "1 and 2 St. Peter" and "St. Jude" by F. H. Chase.
In *Encyclopaedia Biblica* on "The Epistle of St. James," "1 and 2 St. Peter," and "St. Jude," by O. Cone.
The following papers in the *Expositor*:—
Ramsay, "The First Epistle attributed to St. Peter," iv. 8. p. 282 f.
Sanday, "The Church in the Roman Empire," iv. 7. p. 401 f.
Rendel Harris, "An Unobserved Quotation from the Book of Enoch," vi. 4, p. 194 f.
R. A. Falconer, "Is Second Peter a Genuine Epistle to the Churches of Samaria?" vi. 5. p. 459 f., 6. pp. 47 f., 117 f., 218 f.

THE gulf which separates the conservative standpoint from that of the more advanced critic is wider in the case of the Epistle of St. James than of any other

book in the New Testament. Differences of view, in varying degrees, do undoubtedly manifest themselves with regard to every single book of the New Testament, but the border lines of the respective critical theories show some tendency to approach, and even to overlap, each other in most cases. The two main positions, however, in reference to the authorship, provenance, date, and character of this Epistle, which at present hold the field, are as wide apart as the poles, and are quite irreconcilable.

The older view, which is also in essentials the traditional view, sees in our Epistle a genuine letter written by St. James, the brother of the Lord, and the first bishop of Jerusalem, somewhere about the year A.D. 40, to Christian Churches composed exclusively of Jews of the Dispersion. The modern critic, on the other hand, regards it as a work of the middle of the second century, the outcome of the age which produced the Shepherd of Hermas, written to Christians at large either by an unknown James, or issued pseudonymously by an author who desired to take shelter under the name of an Apostolic James. There are other suggestions as to the origin and date of the letter of which we shall have more to say later, but the more important theories are those we have described above. The conservative standpoint is best represented by Professor J. B. Mayor, the author of the standard English commentary on the Epistle, which was first published in 1892. A revised and enlarged edition was issued in 1910, and a still later edition was put forth last year (1913). Twenty-one years of continuous and devoted study of the Epistle have elapsed between the appearance of the first

and last editions of this exhaustive work, but the progress of time and the advent of new ideas have not substantially affected his conclusions, and his withers are entirely unwrung by the attempts of German scholars to relegate the Epistle to the fourth and fifth decades of the second century, a position which he criticises with a candour and vigour that are quite refreshing.

The following are the data furnished by the Epistle itself, by whose help the many problems connected with it have to be solved :—

TITLE.—The Epistle is a homily in the form of a letter addressed by "James, a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are of the Dispersion."

THE READERS.—The readers are "brethren," partakers of a common faith, subject to the "perfect law of liberty." They are not a homogeneous body, and among them are found some who disbelieve, some who blaspheme the name of Christ, and some who oppress and ride roughshod over the others. The community as a whole is apparently a poor one, but it has its richer members, among whom are the oppressors and persecutors who are rebuked with such relentless severity in the course of the letter. The "brethren" are exposed to many and grievous trials and temptations, and the letter reveals the presence among them of faults and weaknesses, which call forth the most emphatic condemnation on the part of the writer. They have become weak in the faith, and murmur against God and their fellow-men. They are "hearers of the word" only and not "doers"; time-servers, snobbish, deficient in practical charity, ambitious to be teachers, consumed with jealousy and

faction, contentious, pleasure-loving, given to oaths, and forgetful of God.

Ecclesiastical Organisation.—Of anything like ecclesiastical organisation there is hardly a trace in the Epistle. The community is described in v. 14 as an ἐκκλησία under the superintendence of "presbyters," who administer an "unction of the sick." The meeting for public worship is called a συναγωγή in ii. 2, but whether this refers to a "synagogue" in the technical Jewish sense, or simply means "assembly," is a much-disputed point.

The Author.—That the author is undoubtedly a Jew is manifest from the unmistakable Jewish colouring of the Epistle as a whole. This is seen not only in the fact that the entire background of the Epistle is formed by the Old Testament. The writer has also a wide acquaintance with Rabbinic literature and with such products of Palestinian Judaism as the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Wisdom of Ben-Sirach. Side by side with these purely Jewish elements, however, are features which point to the strong influence of Hellenistic culture upon the mind of the author. His knowledge of Palestinian Judaism is only equalled by his familiarity with the best-known representatives of that form of Judaism associated with Alexandria. He invariably quotes the Old Testament in the LXX version, even when the LXX differs from the original Hebrew, and the Epistle is saturated with the phraseology and thought of Philo and of the Wisdom of Solomon. He is also indebted in some degree to the older Greek philosophers, and there are phrases and ideas in the letter which owe their origin ultimately to Plato, Aristotle, and to the Stoic writers, but these probably reached

him through the medium of Hellenistic Judaism. The language and style of the Epistle come nearer to the classical models than those of any other book in the New Testament, with the possible exception of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Special Features of the Epistle.—The Epistle is distinguished from all other books of the New Testament by the scantiness of the definite Christian material contained in it, a feature which is so well marked that at first sight the letter as a whole seems scarcely to rise above the level of the Old Testament. The great Christian doctrines are conspicuous by their absence. There is no reference to the Life, the atoning Death, or the Resurrection of Our Lord, and His Messianic claims are entirely ignored. On the other hand, in a document which is strikingly Jewish in its general tone, there is no trace of the Mosaic law and ritual, and the Epistle is quite devoid of any reference to the Judaistic controversy regarding the admission of the Gentiles into the Christian Church.

The Literary Relationships of the Epistle.—1. It contains no actual quotations from the *Synoptic Gospels*, but has a remarkable number of reminiscences of the sayings of Jesus, and the author manifests a special predilection for the Sermon on the Mount in the form in which it appears in the First Gospel.

2. A relationship of some kind between our Epistle *and those of St. Paul, notably Romans, 1 Corinthians, and Galatians*, is demanded by the passage concerning "justification" in ii. 15 f. There is also an undoubted literary connection between it and *1 St. Peter* and *Hebrews*.

In all these cases the question whether our Epistle is dependent on them, or *vice versa*, is a matter of

considerable dispute, and is of great importance in helping us to arrive at a decision with regard to its probable date.

3. There are very striking parallels between the Epistle and the *speech* and *circular letter* attributed to St. James in *Acts xv. 13-33*, while the Epistle as a whole has much that is in sympathy with *St. Luke's writings*. This is seen more especially in the attitude towards wealth which is common to both writers.

4. There is nothing like a general agreement as to the use made of the Epistle by *Patristic writers*. Mayor claims that it is quoted by Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Epist. ad Diognetum, Hermas, and Irenaeus, but advanced criticism practically confines its use to Hermas among second-century authors.

The External History of the Epistle.—The external history of the Epistle was a chequered one. It was certainly known and used in Rome from the middle of the second century, but without authority. It was also used at Alexandria by Clement, Origen, and Dionysius, but with considerable hesitation as to its Apostolic position. It formed part of the Syriac Canon, but there is no trace of it in North Africa. It was placed by Eusebius among the Antilegomena. Neglected in the West until late in the fourth century, it finally won its way into the Canon through the influence of Jerome and Augustine. In the East, after the time of Eusebius, it was accepted by all Greek writers with the exception of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

The Situation as Reconstructed by Mayor.—It will be convenient first of all to consider the theory with regard to the authorship and date of the Epistle

which Mayor builds out of these materials. It was written by James, the brother of the Lord and the first head of the Church of Jerusalem, to the Churches of the Eastern Dispersion established in Babylonia and Mesopotamia, and was addressed to Jews, most of whom were Christians, but living in community with unconverted members of their own race. Among these unconverted Jews we are to seek for the rich oppressors who are condemned so unsparingly in the Epistle. It originated in Jerusalem somewhere about the year A.D. 40.

Author.—In defence of the Jacobean authorship he urges: (1) The authority which the writer assumes, which is only consistent with one whose office it was to interpret Christianity to the Jews, and who was looked up to as the natural leader of Jewish Christianity. (2) The striking resemblances between the Epistle and the speech and circular letter of St. James recorded in Acts xv. (3) The local and geographical allusions in the Epistle, such as the references to the cultivation of olives and figs, salt and bitter springs, the neighbourhood of the sea, point to Jerusalem as the home of the writer.

The Readers.—The readers are Jewish Christians probably belonging to the Eastern Dispersion, because Peter, writing afterwards, addresses his letters to the Churches of the Western Dispersion to avoid clashing with the letter of James. Their Jewish descent is indicated by the use of such phrases as "Abraham our Father," "Lord God of Sabaoth," and by the fact that they are assumed to be familiar with the story of Job, Elijah, and the prophets. They meet in a "synagogue," and a high value is attributed to the Law and to a confession of the unity

of God. The references to Jewish oaths and the Jewish propensity to curse and swear, as well as to the avarice and restless pursuit of wealth, so characteristic of the race, point in the same direction.

The Priority of the Epistle to the Pauline Writings.—Mayor strongly insists that the phenomena demand that our Epistle preceded the Epistles of St. Paul. The germs only are found in St. James, whereas in St. Paul we have reached the period of the fully-developed article, and the mere hints of our Epistle are replaced by the full Pauline conceptions. It is, therefore, much easier to imagine St. Paul, who wrote from a more advanced standpoint, bringing out and emphasising the more distinctively Christian doctrines, which were still undeveloped and to some extent latent in St. James, than the latter going deliberately backwards when these doctrines had received definite expression. He denies that there is any essential connection between the passage in this Epistle which deals with "faith and works" and the Pauline doctrine of justification. The sole purpose of James' argument was, in the words of John Bunyan, to insist that "at the Day of Doom men shall be judged according to their fruit," and it is entirely independent of St. Paul's standpoint and unrelated to the Judaistic controversy.

The Absence of Distinctive Christian Doctrine.—St. James is writing to Christians who accept Christ as the Lord of Glory and as the future Judge, and it was therefore not necessary to prove to them that Jesus was the Messiah. They undoubtedly exhibited an immature stage of Christianity, such as is quite intelligible in the case of communities some of whose members had been converted on the day of Pentecost,

and others of whom had been evangelised later by passing teachers, but still existed without the advantages of any regularly organised system of Christian teaching.

The non-Christian tone of the Epistle may also be partly due to the fact that the incidents of our Lord's life were less familiar to these early Jewish converts of the Diaspora than the Old Testament Scripture narratives read to them every Sabbath, and partly to the fact that the Epistle was meant to influence unconverted as well as converted Jews.

THE DATE OF THE EPISTLE.—A date comparatively early in the history of St. James is demanded by the complete absence of any reference to the Judaistic controversy. The Epistle was, therefore, written before the vexatious problem of the admission of the Gentiles into the Christian Church had appeared on the horizon. The primitive stage of Church discipline and order indicated in the letter, where the Church officials are confined to elders and teachers, and where the teaching is still unorganised, also speaks of an early date. The comparatively non-Christian tone of the Epistle presupposes a period not long after the first Pentecost. On the other hand, the position of authority assumed by the writer, the fact that the persons are no longer recent converts, and the reference to a persecution in the Epistle, probably that associated with the martyrdom of Stephen, make a date earlier than A.D. 40 improbable. Mayor, therefore, suggests A.D. 40 and 50 as the *termini* between which the date of the Epistle must fall.

Further Suggestions as to the Date of the Epistle.—(1) Many scholars, as, *e.g.*, Hort, who accept the traditional authorship of the Epistle, are unable to

accept a date as early as A.D. 40–50 because, in their opinion, it exhibits undoubted marks of acquaintance with the Pauline Epistles. They also urge that the wide dissemination and the demoralised condition of the Churches addressed demand a longer period of history and development than is consistent with a date in the fifth decade of the first century. They, therefore, suggest a date towards the close of St. James' life, which took place in A.D. 62. The entire absence of any reference to the question of the relations between Jewish and Gentile Christians in the Church, which had been the one absorbing topic for more than ten years, would seem to decide definitely against this suggestion.

(2) A date between A.D. 70 and 95 appeals to those who do not accept the Jacobean authorship, but recognise in the use of the Epistle by Clement of Rome a *terminus ad quem* in the matter of date. This date has, it seems to me, little or nothing to recommend it. It suffers from the disabilities associated with both the traditional and advanced positions, and possesses the merits of neither. The conservative standpoint gives us a situation which satisfies many of the demands of the problem and is supported by tradition, and the more modern view provides us with a literary and doctrinal milieu which explains some of the more striking features of the Epistle. A date between A.D. 70 and 95 does neither the one nor the other. The echoes of the great controversy which threatened to divide the Church into two hostile forces were not yet stilled, and there is nothing in the Christian literature of the period which is in any way parallel to the Epistle of St. James in the vagueness and scantiness of its Christology. The great merit of

the second century date is that it introduces us to an age which produced Christian documents whose "blanched Christology" [1] bears a remarkable resemblance to that of our Epistle. It seems to me, therefore, that we are tied down either to an early date, when an undogmatic and immature Christianity is intelligible, and when the Judaistic controversy had not yet arisen, or to a date in the second century, when the controversy had been forgotten and Christianity had relapsed into a condition which is reflected in the pages of the *Didachē* and the *Shepherd of Hermas*.

A Date in the Second Century.—We shall do well, therefore, to devote our attention in the remainder of the chapter to the case that is made out for a date in the second century. It is hardly necessary to remark that a letter written in the middle of the second century could not possibly have been addressed to communities composed exclusively of Jewish Christians. Even if it were possible to prove that Churches of this character were to be found in the Dispersion at a very early stage of primitive Christianity, it is quite certain that none existed in the second century. The language, therefore, which seemed to indicate the Jewish descent of the readers is now interpreted of Christians generally as the "ideal Israel." The absence of any reference to Jewish customs and ritual is also adduced as evidence in support of this contention. The theory as a whole perhaps depends more upon the difficulties associated with the traditional authorship than upon any very strong positive arguments, although the latter are not wanting.

First of all it is maintained that a Jew of Galilee could not possibly have possessed the knowledge of

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 471.

Greek and the wide culture which are displayed by the author of the Epistle, and that the silence about Christ, and more especially the ignoring of His earthly Life, Death, and Resurrection, are unintelligible in the case of one so closely connected with our Lord as James of Jerusalem was. Much is also made of the undoubted dependence of the Epistle upon St. Paul, 1 St. Peter, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Then again the moral degeneracy depicted in the Epistle is said to imply a long period of development, and it is claimed that the worldliness which is so severely rebuked can only be paralleled in the *Shepherd of Hermas*. Harnack,[1] who is a strenuous advocate of the second-century date, points out that the traditional date demands that in the period A.D. 30–50 there was a Christianity which was closely allied to that of Justin Martyr, Hermas, and the so-called second Epistle of Clement, and that it reappeared again about a century later, although St. Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and St. John had appeared and taught in the interval, a hypothesis which, according to him, has only to be formulated to be decisively rejected. As we have already stated, the one conspicuous merit associated with this theory is that it does point to a period in the history of the Church which produced Christian literature, such as the *Didachē*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and the Epistle to Diognetus, presenting marked affinities with our Epistle both as to its Christology and its picture of the moral and religious tone of the Church at the time.

There are two considerations which appear to me to militate strongly against the Jacobean authorship of the Epistle:

[1] Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 486.

1. The striking absence of references to Christ, and the lack of any definite Christian teaching. Mayor [1] acknowledges the force of this objection.

2. The style and language of the Epistle, and the evident acquaintance of the writer with Hellenistic literature and culture.

It was not impossible perhaps for a Galilean fisherman to learn to write good Greek, and Mayor's analogy of the Welshman who acquires a good knowledge of English can be endorsed by the experience of the present writer, who was born and bred among typical Welsh surroundings, and yet possesses at any rate a fair command of English. Galilee and its neighbourhood were studded with Hellenistic cities, and produced some of the most accomplished literary men of that age, such as Philodemus the Epicurean, the friend of Cicero; Theodorus, the instructor of Tiberius in rhetoric; Meleager, the famous writer of epigrams; and Menippus the cynic.[2] A great authority like Moulton [3] also agrees that there need be nothing surprising in the fact that a member of our Lord's own circle should reach a perfect readiness in Greek expression. And yet the general impression that the Epistle leaves on my mind is that it is the work of one who had closer contact with Hellenistic influences and modes of thought and expression than would be natural in a writer with a Galilean or Palestinian environment.

The time is hardly ripe perhaps for a definite decision in one direction or another with regard to the authorship and date of the Epistle, but I am strongly of opinion that if it was not written by St. James

[1] Mayor, *op. cit.* p. clxxxviii. [2] *Ibid.* p. lxi.
[3] Moulton, *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 488.

somewhere about the year A.D. 40, we must assign it to the middle of the second century.

SOME FURTHER THEORIES AS TO THE DATE AND CHARACTER OF THE EPISTLE.—Before the chapter is closed reference must be made to two interesting suggestions which profess to explain the Jewish colouring of the Epistle as well as its lack of Christian doctrine:

1. The first is Spitta's[1] theory (which was also put forth independently by the French scholar, Massebieau) that the Epistle is originally the work of a Jewish writer, which was afterwards edited and adapted for the uses of the Christian Church. Spitta maintains that there are only two definite Christian passages in the whole Epistle, viz. i. 1 and ii. 1, where the expression "our Lord Jesus Christ" occurs. In both these cases the name has been interpolated, and he argues that both verses would read just as well, if not better, if the name of Christ were omitted. If we set aside these two verses there is nothing in the Epistle which may not be paralleled from Jewish writings, and the letter as a whole does not rise above the level of pre-Christian Jewish literature. Spitta, however, has exaggerated the lack of Christian material in the letter, and does not do anything like justice to the unmistakable Christian tone of expressions like those which occur in i. 18, ii. 7, and v. 7-8, "the word of Truth," "the honourable Name," and "the coming of the Lord."

2. The second theory comes from Moulton,[2] who suggests that the Epistle was written by James of Jerusalem, but to Jews. This would explain the

[1] Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, vol. ii., 1896.
[2] Moulton, *Expositor*, vii. 4. p. 45 f.

scarcity of definite Christian elements in a Christian document. The writer was anxious not to weaken his appeal by specific reference to Christ and above all to the scandal of the Cross. He contented himself, therefore, with including many of His sayings, which he hoped would commend themselves by their intrinsic beauty and worth to his readers, and so prepare them for a fuller exposition of the Christian faith in the near future. The references to Christ which appear in the Epistle in its present form were, therefore, absent from the original composition. It is, however, not easy to understand why James should have adopted a different method from that of Peter and Paul, who never hesitated to present the Christian case in all its completeness, even when addressing a purely Jewish audience.

CHAPTER VI

THE NON-PAULINE EPISTLES (*contd.*)

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

THE READERS.—Before we proceed to discuss the problem of the authorship it will be well to dispose of the question of its primary recipients, concerning which there is now practically no difference of opinion. Tradition from Origen downwards was all but unanimous in regarding the Epistle as addressed to Jewish Christians, although Jerome and Augustine dissented from this view. This conclusion was based mainly on the use of the words παρεπίδημοι and διασπορά in the address, and of πάροικοι in the body of the Epistle. Recent research into the literature and inscriptions of the period has, however, proved that παρεπίδημοι and πάροικοι were employed quite independently of any Jewish connotation, and were the ordinary terms for strangers temporarily residing in a district, and for residents who were not citizens. Now the contents of the Epistle as a whole seem to imply most clearly that Christians of a Gentile origin are mainly contemplated by the writer (more especially i. 14, 18, ii. 10, iv. 2, 3, where such phrases as "time of your ignorance," "vain manner of life," "desire of the Gentiles," "abominable idolatries," are used in reference to their pre-Christian condition). As the

terms which were supposed to indicate their Jewish origin need no longer be so interpreted, the traditional theory is now all but universally abandoned, and B. Weiss and Kühl stand almost alone in their advocacy of it. The terms "sojourners," "pilgrims," and "dispersion" are manifestly employed in a symbolical sense, and refer to the condition of Christians as the true Israel of God, scattered throughout an alien world, in which they have no abiding city, and as citizens of a heavenly Kingdom to which they shall be received when the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls shall appear.

The Churches addressed are dispersed throughout Pontus, Galatia, Capadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, a list which includes the whole of Asia Minor, north and west of the Taurus. The writer here evidently adopts the Roman provincial nomenclature, and the separation of Pontus and Bithynia, which formed one single province, must be due to some motive of a practical character. The Epistle is a circular letter intended for the principal Christian communities in that wide district, and a glance at the map shows that the order in which the provinces are enumerated indicates a journey on the part of the bearer of the letter from one of the seaports of Pontus (Sinope perhaps), through the chief cities of each province, and finishing in Bithynia on the shores of the Euxine.

Author.—The Epistle professes to have been written by "Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ," and was from the earliest days unhesitatingly accepted as such. The external authority in favour of the Apostolic authorship is exceedingly strong. It shares with 1 St. John the privilege of having been received into the Canon when no other book of the New

Testament, save the Gospels, Acts, and St. Paul's Epistles, was considered entitled to that honour. It was probably known to Clement of Rome, its use by Polycarp is practically certain, and it is expressly mentioned as the work of St. Peter by 2 St. Peter and Papias. It is not included in the Muratorian Canon, but it is quoted as St. Peter's by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Tertullian, and is placed by Eusebius among the generally accepted Epistles. The internal evidence of the Epistle goes far to establish the Petrine authorship of the Epistle. The resemblances to the speeches of St. Peter recorded in Acts are very striking. The position assumed by the writer towards the Christians addressed accords with the situation as set forth in Acts. There is no indication that he was personally acquainted with them, or that he had had any part in their evangelisation. The references to our Lord's life and teaching are neither numerous nor obtrusive, but, limited as they are, they serve to endorse the personal contact of the writer with our Lord's ministry. The presence of the eye-witness would seem to be clearly indicated in the allusion to Christ's sufferings ; and in ii. 23, " When he was reviled, reviled not again," we have possibly a reminiscence of the events of the arrest and trial from one who was actually present.

The attitude of the writer towards Gentile Christianity also agrees perfectly with what we learn of St. Peter from Acts. There is the same unhesitating recognition of the labours of those who preached Christ to the Gentiles and of the equal standing of Gentiles and Jewish Christians.[1] *Prima facie*, then,

[1] Zahn, *op. cit.* vol. iii. p. 174.

the Petrine authorship of the Epistle would seem to be fairly established.

A close examination of the letter shows, however, that the problem is not quite as simple as appeared at first sight, and the objections to the traditional position are both numerous and weighty. There is practically no difficulty connected with the external history of the Epistle, which seems to establish its genuineness beyond a doubt, and any hesitation felt arises from the contents of the letter itself. The objections are based mainly on three factors :

(*a*) The character of the persecution mentioned in the Epistle.

(*b*) Its Pauline tone.

(*c*) Its language and style.

We propose to deal with each of these factors in order.

(*a*) *The Persecution referred to in the Epistle.*—The problem of the authorship and date of the Epistle is closely involved with the history of persecution in the early Christian Church, and our conclusions with regard to these two points will depend largely upon the view we take of the exact character of the particular persecution referred to in the letter. The issue rests with the answers we are prepared to give to these following questions :

1. Was the persecution indicated in the Epistle organised by the State ?

2. Were the Churches addressed in the Epistle punished for the simple profession of Christianity as such ?

3. What was the earliest date at which a persecution by the State and " for the Name " can be said to have arisen ?

A wide difference of opinion exists with regard to the points we have formulated, and consequently the date of the Epistle ranges from about the year A.D. 64 to a period well within the second century, as late as A.D. 135, according to the standpoint of each particular scholar with reference to these questions.

The more advanced criticism of Schmiedel [1] and others demands a date in the reign of Trajan, on the ground that the Epistle indicates a condition of affairs similar to that described in the letters of Pliny to that Emperor. Some of the greatest of our authorities on Roman history, such as Mommsen and Hardy, have, however, shown that the situation depicted in the correspondence of Pliny had existed for some considerable time, so that, even if we grant that the Epistle points to a State persecution "for the Name," this is quite compatible with a date decades earlier than the reign of Trajan.

We may then confine ourselves to the discussion whether the phenomena in the Epistle are consonant with a date in the reign of Nero (1) just before the persecution in A.D. 64, (2) just after the persecution, or (3) whether they necessitate a date towards the close of the eighth decade, *i.e.* some fifteen years later.

(1) Those who advocate a date before A.D. 64, and among them are found scholars like Chase and Zahn, maintain that the persecution contemplated in the Epistle was comparatively mild in its character, and consisted chiefly in the fact that Christians were liable to slander, contumely, and ill-usage from the populace at large. The terms used in the Epistle to describe the attitude of heathenism towards

[1] Schmiedel, *Ency. Bibl.* vol. i. col. 761.

Christianity are such words as καταλαλεῖν, λοιδορεῖν, ἐπηρεάζειν, βλασφημεῖν, ὀνειδίζειν, and there is no evidence that an official attitude of persecution was adopted by the Roman authorities against the Christian Church. Christianity, as such, was not yet a recognised offence against the State. There is no hint of a bloody martyrdom, nor imprisonments; nothing is said about judges, acts of worship Christians were commanded to perform, or of recantations under the pressure of persecution.[1] The Epistle was, therefore, written before the storm of Neronian persecution had swept over the Church, and when the attitude of the State, as distinct from that of the populace, was not definitely hostile towards the Church. It is also urged that the language in ii. 13 f., where loyalty and patriotism are inculcated, indicates a period when the practice of such virtues was still possible and natural.

(2) Those who allow that the Epistle points to a condition of affairs when Christians were liable to official interference on the part of the State and were punished for the profession of their religion, independently of the commission of any actual crime, differ as to the earliest date at which such a situation can be postulated.

The divergence here is due mainly to the way in which the language of Tacitus and Suetonius concerning the treatment of Christians is to be interpreted. Mommsen[2] and Hardy[3] maintain that the evidence of these Roman historians proves that Imperial procedure against Christians was initiated in the reign of Nero, and by the Emperor himself.

[1] Zahn, *op. cit.* vol. iii. p. 179. [2] Mommsen, *Expositor*, iv. 8. p. 6 f.
[3] Hardy, *Christianity and the Roman Empire*, pp. 70, 80.

They are followed by Hort,[1] Sanday,[2] and Moffatt,[3] who, with a large number of scholars, place the Epistle in the latter years of Nero, A.D. 64–67.

(3) A small minority of authorities, among whom, however, are Ramsay[4] and Swete,[5] claim that the references to persecution in the Epistle demand a date towards the close of the eighth decade. Ramsay argues in his forcible way that 1 Peter is addressed to communities exposed to persecution, not merely in the form of dislike and malevolence on the part of neighbours, but persecution to the death. Christians were sought out for trial by Roman officials, and suffered for the "Name," pure and simple. The trial took the form of an enquiry into their religion, which gave them the opportunity of "glorifying God in His Name." As the right of capital punishment was confined in Asia to the governor of the province, the precise form of trial contemplated is a complete picture of the trial instituted in the period A.D. 75–80, and carried out in the time of Pliny as part of the fixed policy of the Empire. This method of procedure was not, however, initiated until after the time of Nero, and was due to Vespasian, who revised the Neronian policy in a more precise and definite form. Ramsay allows that the populace had a considerable share in the harrying of Christians, but points out that the alliance between popular and judicial action was necessary for any real persecution in the Roman Empire. If we accept the usual date assigned to St. Peter's martyrdom, *i.e.* between A.D. 64 and 68, Ramsay's theory implies the abandonment of the

[1] Hort, *1 St. Peter*, p. 3 f. [2] Sanday, *Expositor*, iv. 7. p. 407 f.
[3] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 339.
[4] Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 279 f.; *Expositor*, iv. 8. pp. 8 f., 282 f. [5] Swete, *St. Mark*, p. xxi.

Petrine authorship of the Epistle. He is, however, of opinion that tradition concerning the death of the Apostle is none too trustworthy in the matter of date, and that the reference in Tertullian to Clement of Rome as having been ordained by St. Peter gives colour to the supposition that the latter may have lived to a much later period than he is usually thought to have done. In any case he regards the description of the persecution as being quite decisive as to the date of the Epistle, and if St. Peter died before A.D. 70 the Petrine authorship must be abandoned.

The balance of probabilities is, in my judgment, considerably in favour of the Epistle having been written between the years A.D. 64 and 67. The persecution as described by those who advocate the early date is hardly consistent with the language of the Epistle which speaks of a "burning trial," and in which the references to the "Name" and to "suffering as a Christian" are very definite and precise. On the other hand, there is very little historical evidence to show that Vespasian initiated any new procedure with regard to Christians, and this, combined with the difficulty of bringing the Epistle within the lifetime of St. Peter, militates strongly against the date advocated by Ramsay.

(*b*) *The Pauline Element in the Epistle.*—The influence of the Pauline writings upon our Epistle is unmistakable and is universally acknowledged. The connection is most intimate in the case of the Epistle to the Romans, and here the resemblance is so marked and so continuous that it cannot possibly be accidental.[1] The same thoughts, the same rare words

[1] For a list of passages showing the close connection between these two Epistles see Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. lxxv.

appear in both Epistles, and in one passage (Rom. xiii. 1-7 = 1 Peter ii. 13-17) the same ideas occur in exactly the same order. There is also a close affinity between our Epistle and Ephesians, but this is manifested, not so much in the region of language, but rather in identities of thought and in a very remarkable similarity of structure.

The impress of St. Paul's mind and teaching is so clearly marked that it has been maintained that the Epistle could not possibly have proceeded from St. Peter, "the Apostle of the circumcision." It is the Pauline tone of the letter that has influenced Harnack among others to suspect its genuineness as a Petrine letter.[1] This type of criticism is, however, based to a large extent on the assumption that St. Peter was a bigoted adherent of a Jewish form of Christianity, and was permanently and in principle opposed to St. Paul,[2] a relic of the old Tübingen theory still cherished by some scholars. It is only natural that if this Epistle was written from Rome, as is now almost universally acknowledged to have been the case, after some considerable intercourse with St. Paul and after a close study of Romans and Ephesians, both of them connected with the Imperial city, it should exhibit marked indications of the language and teaching of the greater-minded Apostle.

All that we learn of St. Peter from the New Testament gives us the impression of one who was more at home in the realm of action than in that of ideas, and we can well understand that when he came to write an Epistle to Churches, most of which had close associations with St. Paul, he would not disdain to employ the thoughts and conceptions of his fellow-

[1] Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 452. [2] Hort, *1 St. Peter*, p. 4.

Apostle with which he was now so familiar. St. Paul had now left his mark upon all Christian teaching, and St. Peter was not immune to the influence which Paulinism at this period exercised over Christian thought as a whole.

(*c*) *The Language and Style of the Epistle.*—The Greek of the Epistle reaches a fair standard, and exhibits a considerable knowledge of and power over the usages of the language. It cannot be classed, however, with either the Epistle to the Hebrews or the Epistle of St. James in this respect. Its most striking trait is its dependence upon the vocabulary of the LXX, with which the Epistle is saturated from end to end. A very considerable sprinkling of words is also found in the letter which can be traced to the great writers of the classical period of ancient Greek, such as Homer, Plato, Aristotle, Herodotus, and Thucydides, and the writer proves his acquaintance with later Hellenistic writers such as Plutarch, Strabo, and Philo. His knowledge of the LXX is not confined to the strictly canonical books, and we find echoes of the Wisdom of Solomon here and there in the letter. It is also maintained that the writer shows familiarity with some of the products of later Judaism, such as the apocalyptic Books of Enoch.[1]

It has been argued that the Greek of the Epistle is far too good for St. Peter, who had to employ St. Mark, whose Greek is far inferior to that of this letter, as his ἑρμηνευτής when he came to write down his reminiscences of Jesus. The knowledge that we have acquired by means of the recently discovered

[1] See Rendel Harris in the *Expositor*, vi. 4. pp. 194 f., 346 f., who maintains that 1 St. Peter i. 12, iii. 19, 20, iv. 17, are based on Enoch (Greek) i. 2, and who makes the interesting suggestion that 1 St. Peter iii. 19, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι should read Ἐνὼχ . . .

papyri shows that it is by no means inconceivable that a native of Galilee should possess a good working knowledge of the Greek language, and more than this the Epistle does not imply.

Some minor objections are put forward against the genuineness of the Epistle, such as that it contains so little evidence of such close personal acquaintance with our Lord on the part of the writer as we might have naturally expected if it was written by St. Peter. It is also asserted that it is very unlikely that St. Peter should have written at all to the Pauline Gentile Churches in Asia.

In answer to the first objection it may be noted that in this respect our Epistle is on a par with every other New Testament document, with the sole exception of the four Gospels. "The facts of the New Testament point to the conclusion that in their public teaching, oral and written, the Apostles confined concentrated attention on the great momenta of our Lord's manifestation—the sufferings, death, resurrection, and exaltation." [1]

With reference to the second difficulty, if St. Paul was dead when the Epistle was written, the leadership of the Churches, Pauline and otherwise, would devolve naturally upon St. Peter, and there is nothing incongruous in the fact that he should have taken upon himself the task of writing this letter, with its message of comfort and sympathy, to those who sorely missed the presence and voice of their own great Apostle.

THE CONNECTION OF SILVANUS WITH THE EPISTLE.—The difficulties connected with the Pauline element in the Epistle and its Greek style have led some

[1] Chase, Hastings' *Bible Dict.* vol. iv. p. 787.

writers [1] to suggest that the reference to Silvanus in v. 12, and more especially the emphasis on his trustworthiness, imply that he had no small share in the composition of the letter itself. If Silvanus was the actual scribe of St. Peter, and further if we are to identify him with the Silas of Acts, this would go a considerable way towards explaining the influence of Paulinism upon the language and thought of our Epistle, and might also account for the fairly wide acquaintance with the Greek language and culture which the Epistle exhibits. Zahn [2] goes even further than this, and argues that Silvanus was more than a messenger and amanuensis: "His task in the composition of the letter was so important and so large that its performance required a considerable degree of trustworthiness. Therefore Peter left the composition of the letter to him because he regarded him as better fitted than himself and better fitted than any one else to express in an intelligible and effective manner the thoughts and feelings which he (St. Peter) entertained towards the Gentile Christians of Asia Minor." The language of v. 12 is, however, decidedly strange if Silvanus used it concerning himself, and makes it difficult to believe that he was the actual author of the Epistle.

The Pseudonymous Theory.—Those who deny the Petrine authorship, either because the persecution mentioned in the Epistle demands a date later than the lifetime of St. Peter, or because the dominance of the Pauline element is inconceivable in a genuine Petrine letter, must of necessity have recourse to the pseudonymous theory. It is difficult, however, to

[1] Zahn, Bigg, Bacon, and Milligan.
[2] Zahn, *op. cit.* vol. iii. pp. 149-150.

understand what motive could have impelled an anonymous writer to issue an Epistle of this precise character under the banner of St. Peter. It contains nothing that required the special authority associated with the name of an Apostle in order to ensure its reception. There is no heretical teaching to oppose, and no special doctrine to proclaim. Again, if an Apostolic name was necessary, why prefix St. Peter's name to a letter which is saturated through and through with Paulinism, and thus give immediate cause for suspicion as to its genuineness? If St. Peter's name was needed to guarantee a cordial reception for the letter, why did the writer content himself with the mere mention of his name, and lay no emphasis upon his Apostolic position and prestige?

HARNACK'S THEORY.[1]—Harnack, who is decidedly opposed to the Petrine authorship, will have nothing to do with the pseudonymous theory, and if he has to choose between a genuine Petrine document and an Epistle written by a pseudo-Petrus he has no hesitation in pronouncing in favour of the former conclusion. He has, however, a theory all his own, according to which the prologue in i. 1-2 and the epilogue in v. 12-14 represent late second-century additions to an earlier homily, interpolated in order to gain admission for the letter into the Canon of New Testament Scriptures. He argues that the two passages can be removed without any real loss, and that they are poor in style and are at the root of most of the difficulties connected with the Epistle. It was the earlier document that was known to Clement of Rome, Polycarp, and Papias, and the absence of the title

[1] Harnack, *Chronologie*, pp. 451-465.

explains why the Epistle is not quoted as St. Peter's by any writer before Irenaeus.

The theory does not possess the compelling force which we generally associate with Harnack's work, and it is open to insuperable objections, among which the following are the most important:

1. It does not avoid the difficulty which is so fatal to the pseudonymous theory, viz. why the name of St. Peter should be attached to an Epistle which is Pauline through and through.

2. Our Epistle bears upon its surface all the marks of a genuine letter, and to describe it as a homily is entirely to misconceive its character.

3. Harnack's original document gives us an Epistle which opens with the words, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," a phrase which in every other instance where it occurs in the New Testament comes immediately after the address as in our Epistle.

4. Why should every one of the numerous copies of the Epistle in its original form have disappeared, while the one single copy of the improved edition survived?

5. Harnack has seriously misrepresented the patristic evidence in favour of the Petrine authorship. The Epistle was not only known to Papias, but is actually mentioned by him as the work of St. Peter.

SUMMARY.—To sum up our discussion we may say with very little hesitation that nothing in the internal evidence furnished by the Epistle itself, either as to the character of the persecution mentioned in it, or as to its Pauline tone, demands that we should abandon the view held from the earliest Christian ages that it is a genuine Petrine letter. The suggestion

with reference to the part taken by Silvanus in the composition of the Epistle is interesting and useful, as far as it helps to explain the Pauline influence upon the letter and the quality of the language, but it is not essential. The genuineness of the Epistle is satisfactorily established independently of it.

CHAPTER VII

THE NON-PAULINE EPISTLES (*contd.*)

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE AND THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

THE connection between the Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter is so intimate and so self-evident that it requires no argument to establish it. The exact character of the relationship between the two Epistles is, however, a matter of considerable dispute, and the authors of the two best English commentaries, Dr. Mayor and the late Dr. Bigg, are diametrically opposed to each other on this point. Modern opinion as a whole is, however, in favour of the dependence of 2 St. Peter upon St. Jude, although two great scholars, Spitta and Zahn, agree with Bigg in assigning priority to 2 St. Peter.

In support of the latter position it is claimed that it is much more in accordance with the fitness of things that a comparatively obscure person like Jude should have borrowed from the work of an Apostle of the standing of Peter than that the process should have been reversed. If 2 St. Peter, however, should prove not to be a genuine Apostolic work, very little weight can be attached to this argument. Zahn [1] lays great stress on the fact that what would

[1] Zahn, *op. cit.* vol. iii. p. 266.

appear to be a definite prophecy in 2 St. Peter with reference to the false teachers is actually fulfilled in St. Jude. In the former the future tense is generally used, whereas Jude invariably employs the past. But 2 St. Peter is not consistent in the use of the future, and a past tense is often allowed to intervene. The application of the proverb in ii. 22, *e.g.*, loses all its force unless it implies a state of affairs actually existing, and the description of the false teachers throughout this chapter is much too definite and precise to be a mere forecast of conditions which are still in the future. The prevailing use of the future in 2 St. Peter is probably nothing more than a rhetorical figure.

Again, it is maintained that there is a distinct reference to 2 St. Peter in St. Jude *vv.* 4, 17, 18: "They who were of old set forth unto this condemnation," "The words which have been spoken before by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ"; but it is hardly likely that Jude would use the word πάλαι of a letter which, according to this theory, had been written only some ten or fifteen years previously, and a reference to the prophecy of Enoch quoted in 2 Peter iii. 14, 15, is much more probable. Again the reference in St. Jude *v.* 17 is much too general to be confined to any one particular Apostolic writing, and has in view the Apostolic teaching as a whole, whether oral or documentary. On the other hand, the literary conditions of the problem point unquestionably to the priority of St. Jude. It is a comparatively simple matter to take a brief document as a nucleus of a larger one, and to subject it to a process of elaboration and expansion, as the writer of 2 St. Peter has done with St. Jude, but it is difficult to understand why a

writer should select one particular chapter out of the centre of a larger letter and issue it as a separate work. To do this, and then to convert the extract into a consistent, homogeneous whole which exhibits no trace of the larger work in its vocabulary and style, as Jude has done, is a task that requires a literary skill that is all but miraculous. Further, there are passages in 2 St. Peter which are quite unintelligible without references to the parallels in St. Jude, and this in itself is sufficient warrant for the priority of the latter. Again, St. Jude has all the marks of an original document. Its language is simple and forcible, and far removed from the artificial, laboured, and cumbrous style of 2 St. Peter. There would, therefore, seem to be little room for doubt that the Epistle of St. Jude was the original document and that the author of 2 St. Peter used it as the basis of his own composition.

The Epistle of St. Jude

Author.—The Epistle claims to be written by "Judas, a servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James," and if the letter is a genuine product of the Apostolic age there is no valid reason why it should not have been the work of Jude, the brother of James of Jerusalem, and one of the brethren of our Lord.

Those who argue that the internal evidence of the Epistle points to a date towards the end of the first century rule out the authorship by Jude on the ground that the well-known story told by Hegesippus and quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.* iii. 19), implies that he was dead when his grandsons were interviewed by

the Emperor Domitian.[1] But even according to this story Jude might well have been alive about the year 80 A.D., and, as we shall see in the course of the chapter, there is no pressing necessity for dating the Epistle later than this.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE EPISTLE.—The Epistle was generally accepted as Apostolic and canonical by the end of the second century. It was included in the Muratorian Canon, was commented on by Clement of Alexandria, whose commentary is still extant in a Latin translation, and was quoted by Origen and Tertullian. It did not, however, find a place in the Syriac versions of the New Testament. Its use in the earlier second-century writers is a matter of dispute even among scholars who are agreed as to its authenticity. Mayor[2] finds echoes of it in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, in the *Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians*, and in the *Didachē*, but Chase[3] is of opinion that it is only in the last of the three that any tangible signs of its influence can be traced. It is probable that its limited use by the earlier patristic writers was due mainly to its brevity and its comparative lack of importance. In the third and fourth centuries it was viewed with a certain amount of hesitation and suspicion because of its intimate connection with Jewish apocalyptic literature.

VOCABULARY AND STYLE.—The Jewish descent of the writer is manifest in his complete familiarity with the Old Testament in the LXX version, and probably also in the original Hebrew. His knowledge of Judaistic literature extends beyond the canonical

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 355 f. [2] Mayor, *St. Jude and 2 St. Peter*, p. cxvi.
[3] Chase, Hastings' *Bible Dict.* vol. ii. p. 799.

books, and he is perfectly at home among the products of later Jewish apocalyptic, and makes a wide use of such works as the *Books of Enoch*, the *Assumption of Moses*, and perhaps the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. His Judaistic vocabulary is, therefore, extensive, and manifests throughout the Jewish sympathies of the writer. He has also at command a number of words drawn from Greek classical authors, but it is probable that he derived these through the medium of later Hellenistic authors. The question of St. Jude's indebtedness to St. Paul depends mainly upon the view we take of the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. If these are Pauline, then Jude was undoubtedly acquainted with, and influenced by, the Pauline literature, but he exhibits few signs of familiarity with the earlier Epistles.

In his style he shows a remarkable fondness for triplets, and the Epistle as a whole is strongly rhetorical. The Greek of the letter is much on the same plane as that of 1 St. Peter, and, as we have seen, no valid objection can lie against the authenticity of the Epistle on this score.

The Date of the Epistle.—The decisive factor with regard to the date of the Epistle is the character of the false teaching against which it is aimed. Those who advocate a date in the first quarter of the second century maintain that the heretical movement contemplated in the Epistle has much in common with the incipient Gnosticism dscribed in the Ignatian letters, and must be assigned to the same period. It is extremely doubtful, however, whether the phenomena point to a stage of heretical development beyond what is contemplated in many of the Pauline Epistles. A considerable number of scholars compare

the evils attacked in the letter with those that were prevalent in the Corinthian Church, the immorality, the ungodliness, the profanation of the " agape " and the Eucharist, with which St. Paul was confronted among those recently converted from paganism. It was the intrusion of pagan associations and habits into the Christian community that formed the danger which evoked this letter from St. Jude. The Epistle cannot, however, be placed as early as the Corinthian letters of St. Paul because it presupposes on St. Jude's part some knowledge of St. Paul's later letters. A date in the latter half of the seventh decade of the first century, 65–70 A.D., is perhaps the earliest which can be assigned to it. This would allow time for St. Paul's Epistles to be circulated and become known in Palestine, and would fit in with most of the conditions presupposed in the Epistle, such as the death of some of the Apostles and the dispersion of others.

A strong body of opinion is in favour of a date approximating to 80 A.D. Among those who advocate this view are Mayor, Zahn, and Vernon Bartlet, and Moffatt [1] agrees that if the Epistle can be connected with an Apostolic Jude this is the best hypothesis. It is argued that there are many expressions in the letter which imply a long retrospect, such as " the faith *once* delivered to the saints," " in the last time," and that the heresies combated in the Epistle have more in common with those contemplated in the Epistle to the Colossians and the Pastoral Epistles, and afterwards in their more developed form, in the Epistles of St. John, than with the disorders which afflicted the Corinthian Church. That the character of the " false teaching " attacked in the Epistle does

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 357.

not necessitate a second-century milieu has already been seen, and the other reasons which are adduced to support a date in the earlier decades of this century are not very weighty. The language in reference to the Apostles in *v.* 17 is satisfied if we suppose that some were dead and the others scattered throughout the world, while the argument based on the use of πίστις to denote a definite and formal deposit of faith loses much of its force when the use of the word in the Pauline Epistles is closely examined. The pseudonymous theory labours under the very serious difficulty of explaining why such an unknown and obscure personage like Jude was selected by a writer who was anxious to obtain currency for his letter. Our choice of date lies, therefore, between a date during the years 65–70 A.D. and the corresponding date in the following decade, *i.e.* from 75–80 A.D. The conditions of the problem are on the whole perhaps best satisfied by a date in the latter period.

Occasion and Destination of the Epistle.—If the letter was written by Jude, the brother of our Lord, as we have every reason to believe to have been the case, it is natural to look for its destination in the neighbourhood of Palestine. There is nothing in the Epistle itself to mark the nationality of its recipients, and a community which included Jewish as well as Gentile Christians is probably implied.[1] The readers are confronted with dangers from a pagan environment, a fact which points to some great Gentile city like Syrian Antioch, where pagan influences were strong, and where Gentile thought was particularly active and energetic. Verse 3 seems to imply that Jude had already commenced a letter

[1] Cf. *v.* 3, περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας.

of a general character to this identical Church when he received news of a movement which threatened the very life of the community, and that the original document was immediately laid aside in favour of the present Epistle, with its forcible appeal and vigorous denunciations.

The Second Epistle of St. Peter

Author.—The conclusion that we have arrived at with reference to the relative positions of the Epistles of St. Jude and of 2 St. Peter practically invalidates the claim of the latter to be an authentic Petrine letter. If St. Jude was not written before the year 65 and 2 St. Peter not till some years later, the latter Epistle cannot possibly be brought within the lifetime of the Apostle. It will also be seen that the whole of the evidence available, both internal and external, points inevitably in the same direction, so that we have to acknowledge that the New Testament includes at least one pseudepigraphic document.

Meanwhile something must be said with reference to the more conservative standpoint, which still sees in our Epistle a genuine product from the hand of St. Peter. According to this view [1] the Epistle was written by St. Peter from Antioch while he was on his way to Rome, some time during the years 60–63 A.D., and is, therefore, in reality the first, and not the second, Epistle of St. Peter. It was addressed to a large group of Churches which had been evangelised by St. Peter and other of the Twelve and were mostly composed of Jewish Christians. Its immediate

[1] See Zahn, *op. cit.* vol. iii. p. 198 f.

occasion was the rise of a body of false teachers in the communities concerned, who were immoral in their lives and lax in their doctrines, and were to be sought among Gentile Christians who had read St. Paul's Epistles and claimed his support for their perversions. The letter referred to in St. Peter iii. 1 is not 1 St. Peter, as it is generally believed to be, but an entirely separate document which has been lost. The manifest differences between this Epistle and our 1 St. Peter are due to the fact that the latter was addressed to Gentile Christians, while 2 St. Peter has a Jewish Christian community in view, and the change of tone is largely accounted for by the persecution which threatened the readers of the first Epistle, a trial which had not yet befallen the readers of the second. The tardy reception of 2 St. Peter by the Church and the lack of interest in it displayed by early patristic writers are to be explained by the scanty respect entertained for Jewish Christian documents by Gentile Christians.

The Petrine authorship of the Epistle is put forward in a more precise form by Professor R. A. Falconer.[1] He suggests that the letter was written from Antioch to the Churches of Samaria shortly before St. Peter went to Rome, and that its peculiar style points to the employment of some Greek-speaking Jewish Christian, who was familiar with the religious thought and expression of the Imperial world, as an amanuensis. The false teaching in the Epistle was that which was associated with the name of Simon Magus, who was a native of Samaria, a district which was proverbially the home of magic,

[1] See *Expositor*, v. 5 and 6, "Is 2 Peter a Genuine Epistle to the Churches of Samaria?"

false Messiahs, and of Sadducean sensuality. The subsequent history of the Epistle is explained by its having been written to the Church of Samaria, which soon dropped out of history, as well as by the narrow scope of its contents, its apocalyptic element, and its strange dissimilarity in style and thought to the so-called " first " Epistle of St. Peter.

The pseudonymous origin of the Epistle seems, however, to the present writer to be proved beyond any reasonable doubt. Its relationship to St. Jude and to 1 St. Peter, its external history, and the marks of time within the Epistle itself all combine to form a body of proof which is quite incontrovertible.

We will take each of these points in order, with the exception of the relationship to St. Jude which has already been discussed.

The Relationship of the Epistle to 1 St. Peter.—The two Epistles have so little in common that, were it not for the occurrence of the Apostle's name in both, it is inconceivable that they should ever have been ascribed to the same author. In the matter of style the contrast between the two letters is complete. 2 St. Peter is laboured, cumbrous, and obscure, manifesting throughout a conscious effort after rhetorical effect, while 1 St. Peter is perfectly clear and simple. The gulf is equally wide in regard to their respective attitudes towards the Old Testament and the Gospel history. 1 St. Peter is steeped in the language of the Old Testament, but 2 St. Peter never quotes it and has but few definite reminiscences of its language. 1 St. Peter again reflects throughout the teaching of our Lord, and the death, resurrection, and the heavenly glory of Christ are constantly in the writer's mind, whereas 2 St. Peter has at most

a couple of references to our Lord's sayings, and the great central facts of the Christian faith are never mentioned. The Pauline tone of 1 St. Peter is so striking as to engender suspicions as to its genuineness. 2 St. Peter is content with one definite reference to St. Paul's Epistles, and beyond that it affords no marks of their influence upon the writer. In the matter of sympathy and tender affection towards the readers the writer of 2 St. Peter is far removed from the St. Peter of the First Epistle. The differences between the two Epistles are forcibly summed in a sentence of Mayor's: "On the whole the difference in style is less marked than the difference in vocabulary, and that, again, less marked than the difference in matter, while above all stands the great difference in thought, feeling, and character, in one word, personality." [1]

External History and Literary Affinities of the Epistle.—There is, with one striking exception, no trace of the existence of the Epistle until the beginning of the third century. Mayor thinks it possible that there may be reminiscences of it in Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Heracleon, and Hermas, but Chase is strongly of opinion that the resemblances between the Epistle and these writers are only such as are common to documents which belong to the same period and deal with the same general subject. It is not included in the Muratorian Canon, and we find no substantial trace of it until we come to Clement of Alexandria, who would seem to have commented upon it, but who classed it, not with 1 St. Peter, but with the Apocalypse of Peter. Origen knew the Epistle, but speaks of it with considerable hesitation.

[1] Mayor, *op. cit.* p. cv.

It was entirely unknown to the North African Church, and is mentioned by neither Tertullian nor Cyprian, and it did not find a place in the Old Latin or Syriac versions of the New Testament. Eusebius' description of it is significant: *οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκος μέν, ὅμως δὲ πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανεῖσα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν*,[1] language which strongly reminds us of that of the sixth Article of the Church of England with reference to the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament. It was not acknowledged as canonical until the Council of Carthage in 397. The one single second-century work with which it has any definite literary affinities is the Apocalypse of Peter, fragments of which have been published by Dr. M. R. James, where the resemblances of subject and language seem to be almost too marked to be accidental. It is a moot point whether there is a definite literary relationship between the two documents, in the way of borrowing on one side or the other, or whether the resemblances can be satisfactorily explained by assigning them to the same school of religious thought. Sanday [2] goes so far as to suggest that they may both have proceeded from the same hand. The phenomena seem to point at least to a date in the second century for both the Apocalypse and the Epistle.

Marks of Time furnished by the Epistle.—There would seem to be several definite indications of a late date furnished by the Epistle itself.

(*a*) i. 16, where the reference is apparently to the tradition that the Gospel of St. Mark contained the teaching of St. Peter.

(*b*) iii. 2. Here the Scriptures are described as

[1] Eusebius, vol. iii. 3. [2] Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 347.

consisting of three divisions, Prophets, the Lord (the Gospel), and Apostles, a form of expression which is peculiar to the second century ; cf. Irenaeus i. 8.

(*c*) iii. 4. "Since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were." This would seem to imply that the "fathers," *i.e.* the Apostles and original Evangelists, were dead when the Epistle was written.

(*d*) iii. 16. This is perhaps the most decisive mark of time in the whole Epistle, presupposing as it does that at this period the Epistles of St. Paul had already been formed into a collection, and that they ranked on a level with the "other scriptures," which undoubtedly meant those of the Old Testament.

The Pseudonymous Theory.—The arguments in favour of a pseudonymous authorship in the case of other Epistles of the New Testament are, speaking generally, not convincing. The reference to the reputed author is confined to the address, and his personality is never unduly obtruded. In the case of 2 St. Peter the situation in this respect is unique. There is a manifest attempt throughout the Epistle to attract attention to the person and history of St. Peter by references to the prophecy concerning his death (i. 14), his presence at the Transfiguration (i. 16 f.), the Petrine tradition underlying the Gospel of St. Mark (i. 16), and the First Epistle of St. Peter (iii. 1). In view, therefore, of all these converging lines of evidence it is no longer possible to regard 2 St. Peter as an authentic Petrine Epistle.

Date, Occasion, and Destination.—The phenomena we have been discussing point to a date not earlier than the middle of the second century. The growth of a literature connected with the name of St. Peter, the existence of St. Paul's letters in a

formal collection, the character of the false teaching attacked in the Epistle, make it difficult to bring it down within the first half of that century, while the fact that it was known to Origen and had in his time a history of its own makes a date late in the second half equally difficult. Most scholars assign it to the neighbourhood of A.D. 150, and this is perhaps the nearest approach to the actual date that can be suggested. Ramsay,[1] it is true, assigns the Epistle to the first quarter of the century, but gives no reasons to support his view.

There is very little to help us in arriving at any definite conclusion with regard to the recipients of the Epistle. The emphasis on the equality of Jew and Gentile within the Christian fold in i. 1, the reference in iii. 11 to the use of St. Paul's name and authority by the false teachers, and the phrase, " after they have escaped the defilements of the world," also in connection with the false teachers, would seem to imply readers who were predominantly Gentile and not Jewish in origin, although Jewish Christians are not necessarily excluded. If the letter mentioned in 2 St. Peter is to be identified with 1 St. Peter, the problem of the Epistle's destination is solved, but as the former is pseudonymous we cannot attach much weight to this identification. Mayor [2] suggests Rome as the probable destination, and the Epistle to the Romans as the letter of Paul's mentioned in iii. 15. In the absence of more definite information it is wiser perhaps not to dogmatise with regard to details of this character, but we shall not be far wrong if we see in 2 St. Peter, which is unquestionably the latest

[1] Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 432 *n.*
[2] Mayor, *op. cit.* p. cxxxix.

of the books of the New Testament, a Catholic Epistle, written to Christians in general, by one who used the great name of St. Peter in order to commend to the Church at large certain views which he regarded as important, and which he believed to be in accordance with that Apostle's teaching.[1]

[1] Mayor, *op. cit.* p. cxxiv.

CHAPTER VIII

THE JOHANNINE LITERATURE

Literature

On the Fourth Gospel. Chapters VIII. and IX.

Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays.* 1893.
Drummond, *An Enquiry into the Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.* 1903.
Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents.* Part I. 1903.
Armitage Robinson, *The Study of the Gospels.* 1903.
The Historical Character of St. John's Gospel. 1908.
Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile.* 1903.
Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel.* 1905.
Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission.* 1906.
H. L. Jackson, *The Fourth Gospel and some recent German Criticism.* 1906.
Schmiedel, Article "John, the Son of Zebedee" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*
The Johannine Writings. 1907. E.T.
E. A. Abbott, *Diatessarica.* Seven vols. 1900–1907.
Westcott, *The Gospel of St. John.* Greek Text and Notes. 1908.
E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology.* 1909.
Askwith, *The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel.* 1909.
Brooke, "The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel" in the *Cambridge Biblical Essays.* 1909.
B. W. Bacon, *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate.* 1910.
A. V. Green, *The Ephesian Canonical Writings.* 1910.
Articles on "St. John's Gospel" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* and *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels,* and on the "Gospels" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*

On the Johannine Epistles. Chapter X.

Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John.* 1892.
Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen,* vol. xv. 3.
Findlay, *Fellowship in the Life Eternal.* 1909.
A. E. Brooke, "The Epistles of St. John." 1912. (*Int. Crit. Comm.*)
Articles on "The Epistles of St. John" in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* by S. D. F. Salmond, and in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* by Schmiedel.
Papers in the *Expositor* by—
Rendel Harris, vi. 3. p. 194 f. on "The Problem of the Address in the Second Epistle of St. John," and by Ramsay, vi. 3. pp. 234, 354 f.

Papers in the *Journal of Theological Studies* on "The Historical Setting of the Second and Third Epistles of St John," by Dom. Chapman (1904, pp. 357 f., 537 f.) and by Vernon Bartlet (1905, p. 204 f.).

THE APOCALYPSE. Chapter XI.

Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos.* 1895.
Bousset, *Antichrist.* 1896. E.T.
Die Offenbarung Johannis. 1906.
E. C. Selwyn, *The Christian Prophets and the Prophetic Apocalypse.* 1900.
C. A. Scott, "The Revelation of St. John." 1902. (*Century Bible.*)
Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches.* 1904.
Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John.* 1906.
Hort, *The Apocalypse of St. John,* chaps. i.-iii. 1908.
Charles, *Studies in the Apocalypse.* 1913.
Articles on "The Revelation of St. John" in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* by F. C. Porter, and on "The Apocalypse" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica* by Bousset.
Paper in the *Expositor* by Ramsay, viii. 1. p. 161 f.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

THE question of the authorship of St. John's Gospel is perhaps the most fascinating of the problems of New Testament criticism, and is incomparably the most important of them all. This is realised to the full both by those who advocate the Johannine authorship as well as by those who take the opposite view. Bishop Lightfoot opens his discussion of the problem in the following words: "The genuineness of St. John's Gospel is the centre of the position of those who uphold the historical truth of the record of our Lord Jesus Christ given us in the New Testament. It enunciates in the most express terms the Divinity, the Deity, of our Lord, and at the same time professes to have been written by the one man, of all others, who had the greatest opportunities of knowing the truth." [1] Professor B. W. Bacon, who is probably the most prominent member of the opposition at the present time, is equally insistent upon the unique significance of the problem and of the issues involved

[1] *Biblical Essays,* p. 47.

in it. Speaking of the former, he says: "The Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel is the question of questions in all the domain of Biblical science"; [1] and with reference to the issues involved in the discussion he adds: "On this question we are driven unavoidably to the alternative—either Synoptics or John. Either the former are right in their complete silence regarding pre-existence and incarnation, and in their subordination of the doctrine of Jesus' person, in presenting his work and teaching as concerned with the kingdom of God, with repentance and a filial disposition and life, as the requirement made by the common Father for that inheritance; or else John is right in making Jesus' work and message supremely a manifestation of his own glory as the incarnate Logos, effecting an atonement for the world which has otherwise no access to God. Both cannot be true." [2]

The question, then, in other words, resolves itself into a contest between the complete Christianity of the Catholic Church in harmony with the contents of the Gospels as a whole and the reduced Christianity, which we have described in a former chapter, which is based exclusively on the Synoptic Gospels, and in many cases on a very much reduced and tattered version of these Gospels. Of the importance of the problem, then, there can be but one opinion.

The Traditional View.—It may be well to open our discussion by stating, as briefly as possible, what has been for well-nigh seventeen centuries the traditional view with regard to the authorship of this Gospel. This may be conveniently formulated in

[1] Bacon, *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, p. 3.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 3.

the words of Irenaeus and of Clement of Alexandria. Irenaeus tells us that "John the disciple of the Lord who leaned upon His breast himself too set forth the Gospel while dwelling in Ephesus the city of Asia," [1] while Clement is quoted by Eusebius as having stated "that the tradition of the Elders from the first is that John last, having observed that the bodily things had been set forth in the Gospels, on the exhortation of his friends, inspired by the Spirit, produced a spiritual Gospel." [2] Towards the end of the second century, then, it seems to have been fairly generally held that the Gospel was written by St. John, the Apostle, who was at the time in possession of the Synoptic Gospels, and that, in contrast to the latter, it was recognised as being in a special sense a "spiritual Gospel." This tradition held its own from this early period down to comparatively modern times.

It was not until the year 1792 that the first discordant note was struck by Evanson. This was followed in Germany by several works on the same side, none of which were of any great value until Bretschnedder in 1826 published what might be called the first serious and able criticism. In this work all the main lines of attack are laid down, and the conclusion, which was startling enough then, that the writer reached was that the Gospel was fraudulently written by a Gentile in the name of St. John in the middle of the second century, and that the author probably lived in Egypt, whence the Gospel was brought to Rome by some Gnostics. The most serious contribution to the discussion during the first half of the last century was undoubtedly that of

[1] *Adv. Haer.* iii. 1. 1. [2] Eus. *H.E.* vi. 14. 7.

Baur, who in the " forties " put forth the theory that the Gospel was not written until well into the latter half of the second century, and could not possibly be the work of an Apostle, because it gives us a picture of the Church in which Gnosticism, Montanism, and the Paschal controversy are playing their parts. This was the standpoint of the writer of the book *Supernatural Religion*, which somewhat later caused a considerable amount of excitement in England. This stage of the controversy may be said to have been brought to a close by the decisive authority of Lightfoot, who, in his reply to *Supernatural Religion* and in his *Biblical Essays*, proved conclusively that the external evidence made such a date as that advocated by Baur and his English follower impossible. Lightfoot some years later made the following statement: " We may look forward to the time when it will be held discreditable to the reputation of any critic for sobriety and judgment to assign to this Gospel any later date than the end of the first or the beginning of the second century," [1] a forecast which has been all but justified by the event. There is still a tendency to find an argument for a date later than A.D. 135 in chap. v. 43, " If another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive," which it is thought must allude to the revolt of Bar-Cochba, the pseudo-Messiah under Hadrian. Schmiedel [2] makes a strong point of this, but the contention receives little support now, and even critics like Loisy and Bousset consider that the reference does not point to any historical individual, but to the belief that Anti-Christ would arise out of Judaism.

[1] *Expositor*, iv. 1. p. 10.
[2] *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. ii. col. 2551.

But although the question of date may be said to have been practically settled, the controversy has lost none of its vigour. The attack has now, however, shifted its ground, and a new position has been taken, which may be described as follows: "We are prepared to grant that the external evidence proves the existence of the Fourth Gospel from the early years of the second century, but this does not prove that it was written by St. John the Apostle: on the contrary, if properly weighed and considered, it makes such an assumption impossible."

The crux of the Johannine problem is, therefore, no longer the question of date, but the question of its authorship and of its value as giving a historical account of our Lord's Person and teaching.

Arguments for the Johannine Authorship.—During the last ten years four well-known scholars have strongly advocated the traditional view: Professor Stanton in his *Gospels as Historical Documents* (1903); Dr. Drummond in his book on *The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* (1903); Dr. Sanday in his *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* (1905); and Zahn in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, of which an English translation appeared in 1909.

The decision in this case, as in every similar case, must rest on evidence, and the evidence on which judgment has to be passed is of two kinds, external and internal. In order to enable the reader to arrive at a clear understanding of the points at issue, it is necessary to give an outline of this evidence in both its aspects.

1. *External Evidence.*—It should be explained first of all that there is practically no dispute as to what constitutes evidence here. The controversy is

only concerned with the interpretation of the evidence, what it implies, and what conclusions we are entitled to draw from it. It will simplify our task if we begin with that portion of it, concerning the meaning and direction of which there can be no possible doubt. Beginning then with the last two decades of the second century we have the names of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Theophilus, Heracleon, as well as the Muratorian fragment of the Canon, all of whom testify in the clearest manner to the Johannine authorship. The wide extent covered by this body of evidence deserves attention. Gaul, Alexandria, Carthage, Rome, Syrian Antioch are all included in the list, proving that the Johannine authorship was accepted and acknowledged by the length and breadth of the Christian Church. The evidence of Tatian carries us one stage further, for he must have published his *Diatessaron*, a kind of "Harmony of the Four Gospels," before the year A.D. 170. Now although no names are mentioned in connection with the four documents he makes use of, still they are all of equal authority in his sight, all are regarded as authentic records of the life of Christ, and as forming a fourfold Gospel. With regard to this phase of the evidence and what it implies there is practically no dispute, and it is generally admitted by all critics that from the year A.D. 170 and onwards the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel was accepted by the great bulk of the Christian Church. It is with the evidence preceding this date that difficulties and controversies arise. This evidence will now be considered in chronological order, starting with the document nearest in point of time to the Gospel, and we shall then be able to realise its char-

acter, to mark its method of evolution, and to appreciate the value that should be attached to it.

(1) *Clement of Rome.* — The first extra-canonical writer, Clement of Rome, contains no reference to the Gospel, nor does he show any clear signs that he knew it at all.

(2) *Ignatius and Polycarp.*—Ignatius only contains two echoes of Johannine teaching, viz. a reference to "living water" in *Romans* vii., and a description of the Spirit, "It knoweth whence it cometh and whither it goeth," in *Philadelphians* vii.

Polycarp seems to provide an undoubted reference to the first Johannine Epistle in the statement that "Everyone who shall not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is Antichrist" (*Philippians* vii.).

(3) *The Didachē.*—In the *Didachē* in the ancient Eucharistic prayer there is the remarkable phrase "to make perfect in love," with which we may compare St. John xvii. 23.

(4) *The Epistle of Barnabas.*—The most that can fairly be said of this document is that we have traces of Johannine thought and vocabulary in it, which tend to show that it is more than probable that the Gospel was in existence and known to the writer.

(5) *The Shepherd of Hermas.*—This has no quotations from the Gospel, and the evidence here again is confined to the fact that the two documents have a number of resemblances in language and ideas.

We now come to the evidence of two witnesses, which has been the cause of endless discussion and controversy in the past, a condition of affairs which gives no promise of coming to an end in the near future. These witnesses are Papias and Justin Martyr.

(6) *Papias.*—Papias was bishop of Hierapolis in Asia Minor, who, according to Eusebius, wrote a book called Ἐξηγήσεις Κυριακῶν Λογίων (an Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord) of which nothing has been preserved save the preface, which is quoted by this historian.[1] Papias is interesting as being the first writer who mentions the Apostle St. John by name, and who attaches names to some of the Gospels. In some respects he does not help us much in our enquiry, because he mentions a second John, whom he calls "the Elder," and the close proximity of the two names has caused endless confusion. He refers to Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark by name, but has not a word to say concerning St. Luke or St. John in that connection. In a list of Apostles, beginning with Peter, John comes last but one and just in front of Matthew, and it has been conjectured that the two names may have been placed next to each other because the two were both Apostles and Evangelists. We have evidence from other sources to show that he knew the Apocalypse and accepted it as authoritative,[2] and Eusebius declares that he knew and used the First Epistle of St. John and the First Epistle of St. Peter. There is also a Latin *argumentum* prefixed to a Vatican MS. of the Vulgate, of the ninth century,[3] which alleges that "one Papias by name has related in his *esoteric*, that is in his last five books, that the Gospel of St. John was published and given out to the Churches by John while still in the body." Irenaeus again says that "Papias was a hearer of John," and the context plainly shows that he means the Apostle, but Eusebius[4] corrects

[1] Eus. *H.E.* iii. 39. [2] Eus. *H.E.* iii. 39. 16.
[3] Burkitt, Appendix II. Two lectures on the Gospels.
[4] Eus. *H.E.* iii. 39. 2.

Irenaeus on this point, and states that Papias certainly does not declare that he himself was a hearer and eye-witness of the Holy Apostles. Eusebius also says that Papias distinguished the Presbyter John from the Apostle of that name, and adds, "evidently meaning the Evangelist," but we have no means of knowing whether Eusebius found anything in the writings of Papias which spoke of St. John definitely as the Evangelist. Stanton [1] sums the evidence of Papias by declaring that there is good reason to believe that he knew and used the Fourth Gospel.

(7) *Justin Martyr.*—It is acknowledged by practically all critics that Justin was acquainted with the Gospel. The most significant parallel, if not indeed a direct quotation, occurs in the description of Christian Baptism in the first Apology,[2] where he says: "Then they are brought by us to a place where there is water, and in the manner of being born again, in which we also were born again, they are born again, for they then bathe in the water in the Name of the Father and Sovereign God of the universe, and of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit. For Christ also said, '*Unless ye be born again ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven.*' But that it is impossible for those who are once born to enter into the wombs of those who brought them forth is evident to all."

Now this passage in italics reminds us irresistibly of St. John iii. 3-5 (our Lord's remark to Nicodemus), and I know of no critic who disputes the fact that there is a relation which is not accidental between the two passages. Yet there are several

[1] Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, p. 57.
[2] Just. Mart. *Apol.* vol. i. 61.

features in the passage from Justin which are worth noting.

There are several striking verbal differences.

(*a*) In Justin regeneration is spoken of as "born again" (*ἀναγεννηθῆτε*) simply, instead of "born from above" (*γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν*) "of the water and the spirit," as in the Gospel.

(*b*) The statement in Justin is in the second person and not in the third, as in the Gospel. "He cannot" of the Gospel becomes "Ye shall not" in Justin.

(*c*) "Kingdom of God" is changed into "Kingdom of Heaven." In this respect the passage has more affinity with the parallel passage in St. Matthew xviii. 3, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven," and it looks as if Justin might have combined from memory extracts from the two Gospels.

To increase our difficulty this passage occurs almost word for word in the *Clementine Recognitions and Homilies*, and it becomes a moot point whether the Clementines have borrowed from Justin, or both have borrowed from a common source, which in that case could not have been the Fourth Gospel.

There are other passages in Justin's works which are claimed as quotations from St. John by some and rejected by others, but the proof of Justin's acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel does not rest on exact quotations, of which there are none, but on the general tone of his writings, and more especially on his conception of the Person of Christ, and on the emphasis laid on the Logos doctrine in the course of his arguments.

It is true that his philosophy and his teaching with regard to the Logos are full of Alexandrine ideas, but the thought of the Incarnation of the Logos, of which Justin makes full use, is found only in St. John. Justin mentions none of the Gospels by name, but refers to them as "Memoirs of the Apostles." From the quotations scattered throughout his writings it is quite evident that he includes the Synoptic Gospels among these, but it is doubtful whether the Fourth is among the number. There would seem to be about 170 citations from or references to the Gospels in Justin, and apparently only three of them are claimed as belonging to St. John.

Another fact of importance in connection with the evidence of Justin is that he names St. John as the author of the Apocalypse.

This concludes our review of the external evidence extant in the period included between the names of Clement of Rome and Justin Martyr, and we are now in a position to appraise its value, and to realise both its strength and its weakness. Looking at each portion of the evidence by itself it is not too convincing, but its cumulative effect is not inconsiderable. Down as far as the year 155 (Justin's approximate date) the character of the evidence is as follows: The name of St. John is never once mentioned in connection with the Gospel, and the manner of its use by patristic writers does not justify us in reaching any more definite conclusion than that it was known, but by no means so well known as the other three Gospels. In the writers of the earlier section of this period it is doubtful whether the evidence is clear enough to enable us to demand more than that there was a body of Johannine thought and teaching current.

The later writers show an undoubted acquaintance with the Gospel itself. If we had nothing more than the external evidence of this period to go upon it would be difficult to claim for the Fourth Gospel a position of equality with the Synoptics in the mind of the Church of the early second century. Evidence will always appeal in different ways to different minds, and among the strongest upholders of the Johannine authorship there is a considerable divergence of opinion as to the exact weight to be attached to the evidence under discussion. Sanday [1] holds that Drummond is too optimistic in endorsing affirmatively every item of evidence that has ever been alleged, and Stanton [2] takes a very cautious view of its value.

The Problem.—The problem with which we are confronted then is how to explain the sudden emergence of the Gospel from the semi-darkness of the first half of the second century into the blazing sunlight of the year 170 and the remainder of the century, when the authoritative position of the Gospel and the Johannine authorship are acknowledged with hardly a protest. The explanation given by the exponents of the traditional view is that the process is nothing more than the ordinary development that is perfectly natural in such a case. We watch the slow growth of the evidence step by step from the echoes in the Apostolic Fathers, through the stronger indications in the Sub-Apostolic writers, until we arrive at the period of complete certitude about the year 170. The change that is noticeable between 150 and 170 A.D. is also to be partly explained, we are told, by

[1] Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 36.
[2] Stanton, *op. cit.* p. 277.

the fact that for some considerable period the Gospel was confined to Asia, and that it was not until it reached Rome, perhaps through the instrumentality of Justin Martyr himself, that it became known to the Catholic Church at large. Its emergence from the semi-obscurity of the provinces to the full light of Rome, the Christian centre, accounted for its sudden rise to fame and for its general acceptance at this later period.

2. *Internal Evidence.*—The Fourth Gospel is the only one of the four that makes a categorical statement as to the identity of the author. In St. John xxi. 24 it is definitely stated that the Gospel is written by "the disciple whom Jesus loved." In St. John i. 14 and in 1 St. John i. 1 (assuming for the moment that the Gospel and Epistle are by the same hand) we have a claim that the author is an eye-witness of the events he is recording. There is also the evidence of St. John xix. 35, where, after describing the lance-thrust and the pierced side, the narrative goes on: "And he that has seen this has borne witness, and his witness is true: and he (ἐκεινός) knoweth that he saith true, that ye also may believe." There is some doubt concerning the reference in ἐκεινός, whether it refers to the writer himself or to some third person unnamed in the background. Both these solutions are quite possible.

In addition to these explicit claims of authorship, there are also *several passages where the impression conveyed is indirect.*

(1) *The Story of the First Call of the Apostles* (St. John i. 35-51).—The first to attract the notice of Jesus were Andrew and his friend. There are five members of the primary group of our Lord's disciples,

but only four names are mentioned, Andrew, Peter, Philip, and Nathanael, while there is a silent spectator in the background who tells the story.

(2) *The Story of the Woman of Samaria* (St. John iv. 1-42).—Sanday [1] suggests that St. John was actually present during the discourse with the woman of Samaria. "A gentle youth who had not gone with the rest of the twelve, but had remained with the Master and was seated a pace or two away, not wishing to intrude his presence, but eagerly drinking in all that had passed between the Master and His listener."

(3) *The Story of Lazarus* (St. John xi. 1-46).—This also seems to represent the recollections of one who had been present at the events of the day, who had moved freely to and fro among the members of the household, and had probably talked with them after the day was over.

(4) *Two episodes on the night of the Last Supper* stand out as specially graphic and life-like, the description of the feet-washing, and the indication of the traitor (St. John xiii. 1-30).

(5) *The Post-Resurrection Events* (St. John xx).—The presence of the eye-witness is also specially apparent in the record of the events that follow the Resurrection, where the delicate precision of the narrative is to be noted.

The Pragmatism of the Gospel.—Another line of argument in the same direction is found in what Sanday [2] calls the "Pragmatism of the Gospel," by which he means the abundance of detail which is a very marked characteristic of the Gospel, the attention which the author pays to time, persons, and places,

[1] Sanday, *op. cit.* p. 83. [2] *Ibid.* p. 108 f.

the variety of characters that passes before us in the Gospel, and the graphic nature of some of the descriptions.

Now there occurred one tremendous catastrophe between the time that the events recorded in the Gospel took place and the time when the record was actually written, viz. the destruction of Jerusalem, which altered the condition of Judaism absolutely, and completely destroyed its character as the most centralised religion in the world. Previous to 70 A.D. its system of worship, its hierarchy, all had a single centre in the Holy Place and in the Holy City. Now with one single stroke the whole of the Temple system, the hierarchy, the Sanhedrin, as hitherto constituted, came to an end. This then ought to afford us a means of testing the picture given us by St. John of the Jewish people and of the Jewish religion. It is maintained by those who ascribe the Gospel to the Apostle that a careful examination of it gives us a description of Judaism as it existed essentially before and not after the catastrophe, which caused such an absolute revolution in all that affected the religion of the Jew. This statement is supported by the following considerations.

1. *Pilgrimages to Jewish Feasts at Jerusalem.*—Great stress is laid in the Gospel on the periodical visits to Jerusalem, which were not a prominent feature of Jewish life towards the end of the first century. Again the references to the Temple are marked by a minute accuracy which would be all but impossible at a period when the Temple was in ruins and had long ceased to be frequented for the purposes of worship.

2. *The Position of Sects and Parties.*—The marked

distinction between sects, Sadducees and Pharisees, so prominent a feature in the time of our Lord, and so carefully emphasised in the Gospel, had largely disappeared before the end of the first century.

3. *Jewish Practices and Ideas.*—The arguments concerning Judaism and the references to it in the story of the woman of Samaria point decidedly to a Judaism of the pre-destruction period, and the Jewish ideas combated in the Gospel are essentially those of the earlier and not of the later period.

We shall have more to say on the latter half of this statement in the following chapter. At present I will content myself by saying that the facts in this particular department seem to point in the contrary direction.

4. *The Messianic hope* in the Gospel is still in its early stage.

Such then briefly is the evidence, both on its external and internal sides, which is adduced to prove that the Gospel is the work of St. John the Apostle. The first step in the process is to prove that the author was a Jew, which no one seriously disputes, then that he was a Jew of Palestine, which is strongly opposed by some, and finally that he lived through the events that he is describing, which is the crux of the whole controversy. If we are prepared to admit that these propositions are in accordance with the evidence we are then practically tied to the conclusion that the traditional theory is the right one, and that the Gospel was written by St. John, the son of Zebedee.

The Non-Johannine Position.—We will now proceed to enquire what the opposition has to say to this body of evidence which we have been consider-

ing, and upon which conclusions favourable to the Johannine authorship are based.

Among the literature recently published, which upholds the opposite view we may mention, *The Fourth Gospel; Its Purpose and Theology*, by E. F. Scott (1909), Schmiedel's article on "John, the Son of Zebedee" in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (1911), and a work which comes from Professor B. W. Bacon of Yale in America, entitled *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate* (1910), a volume of 500 closely printed pages, in which the subject is treated with a fulness and wealth of detail that would do credit to the most industrious German *savant*.

External Evidence.—First of all then as to the external evidence. The attack is opened by a resolute assault upon the Irenaean tradition, and it is roundly asserted that this tradition, which declared that the Gospel was written by St. John at Ephesus in his old age has no foundation in fact. St. John, it is said, was not at Ephesus at all during the period in question, and there is no evidence that he spent the end of a long life in Asia Minor. On the contrary, there is much that leads us to believe that he ended his days by martyrdom in Jerusalem half a century before the time when he is supposed to have written his Gospel.

This theory that St. John could not have resided in Asia towards the end of the first century is based on a double line of argument.

1. *The Argument from Silence.* (*a*) *The Silence of New Testament Documents.*—Ephesians, Pastoral Epistles, the Address to the Elders at Miletus, 1 St. Peter, and the Synoptic Gospels, all composed in the

last two decades of the first century according to these critics, contain not a single reference to the Johannine sojourn in Asia. Bacon [1] attaches much importance to this argument, but there is no reason for accepting the late date of most of these documents, and this section of the argument does not carry much weight.

(*b*) *The Silence of the Documents of the Sub-Apostolic Age. Clement of Rome.*—Why did Rome, with Clement as its agent, intervene in the affairs of the Church of Corinth when Ephesus was so much nearer with a living Apostle, one of the "pillars," residing there? Why again should Clement not so much as mention St. John? He explicitly refers to St. Peter and St. Paul, both of whom had been long dead, but has not a word to say of the living representative of the Twelve, living in comparative nearness to Corinth. He also speaks of the Apostles in general as if their witness could only be known through their successors, and it is difficult to understand how he could have written in this strain if St. John was still alive.

The Epistles of Ignatius.—Professor Stanton acknowledges that the silence of Ignatius is a very serious difficulty. "In writing to the Ephesians Ignatius expresses the desire that he 'may be found in the company of those Christians who were ever of one mind with the Apostles in the power of Jesus Christ.' St. Paul and St. John may be more particularly in his mind. But as in writing to the Romans he names Peter and Paul, why does he not name both Paul the founder of the Church of Ephesus, and also that venerable Apostle, who, according to the

[1] Bacon, *op. cit.* pp. 162-166.

belief we have under consideration, had lived and taught there more recently and for a longer period? In the immediate sequel he mentions Paul only. At least some personal reference to St. John would have been natural in writing to the Ephesians. So too he might have been expected to recall to Polycarp (in his *Epistle to Polycarp*) the close ties which bound him to St. John, and to remind the Smyrnaeans in his letter to them of the authority which their bishop derived from this connection." [1]

Polycarp.—Polycarp was, according to the Irenaean tradition, a disciple of St. John, and had been appointed by the Apostle to the charge of the Church of Smyrna, and yet, in his Epistle to the Philippians, he looks back not to his own master, St. John, who had only recently died, according to the traditional theory, but to St. Paul, who had been dead for more than fifty years and whom he had never known, as the source of his Apostolic teaching.

Papias.—Papias mentions Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark by name. He also mentions St. John in his list of Apostles, but curiously enough he only comes last but one on his list. He has not a word to say of him in connection with the Fourth Gospel, which he knew and from which he quoted. Yet he was Bishop of Hierapolis, on the very confines of the region where St. John is supposed to have taught.

2. *Positive Evidence.*—The argument from silence is also supported by not an inconsiderable amount of positive evidence pointing to a similar conclusion.

(*a*) It is maintained that the prophecy in St. Mark x. 39=St. Matt. xx. 23 is only intelligible on the supposition that St. John was dead when the

[1] Stanton, *op. cit.* p. 237.

Gospel was written. Moffatt referring to this prophecy says : " Unless it is assumed that this anticipation of Jesus was not fulfilled, we must admit that he foretold a martyrdom of death for the two men (St. James and St. John), and that this had come to pass by the time that Mark's Gospel was published." [1]

(*b*) This is corroborated by an alleged statement of Papias in his second book of the *Expositions* that John " *was killed by the Jews* (*ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνῃρέθη*), thus plainly fulfilling along with his brother the prophecy of Christ concerning them, and their own confession and common agreement concerning him." This quotation from Papias and comment upon it are found in a chronicle of the ninth century by Georgius Hamartolus.[2] There is also a similar reference in what is called the De Boor Fragment, of the seventh or eighth century, of an epitome of the *Chronicle of Philip of Side*,[3] which reads as follows : " Papias in his second book says that John the divine (*θεολόγος*) and James his brother were killed by the Jews." These statements, in the opinion of those who deny the Johannine authorship, indubitably point to the fact that the quotation from Papias is genuine. It is only right to state that this is strenuously opposed by Harnack and E. A. Abbott, neither of whom ascribe the Gospel to St. John, and also by more conservative critics like Stanton, Zahn, and Armitage Robinson.

(*c*) *Evidence of Calendars and Martyrologies.*—A calendar of Carthage of the beginning of the sixth century has on December 27 the Feast of St. John the Baptist and of St. James, the Apostle whom Herod slew. It is quite evident, however, that the

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 602. [2] *MS. Coislinianus*, p. 305.
[3] *Texte und Untersuchungen*, v. 2. p. 170.

Feast was originally that of St. John and St. James, Apostles whom Herod slew, because the Baptist has his own separate Feast in the same calendar on December 24. The change was made owing to the difficulty of reconciling the tradition in the original calendar with the opinion generally held that St. John had ended his days peacefully at Ephesus.

A Syrian calendar of about 410 has the Martyrdom of St. James and St. John, Apostles, at Jerusalem commemorated on December 27. A great German scholar, Schwartz,[1] the greatest living authority on the works of Eusebius, has written a considerable monograph in which he proves to his own satisfaction and to the satisfaction of such critics as Wellhausen, that this tradition is based on actual fact.

(*d*) *The Evidence of Heracleon.*—A further confirmation of the tradition of the early martyrdom of St. John is furnished incidentally by Heracleon, a second-century Gnostic, who in connection with St. Luke xii. 11-12 mentions among those who had escaped martyrdom, "Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi, and many others," but omits the name of John who can hardly have been included among the "many others." Echoes of the tradition are also alleged to be found in the works of Clement of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, and in the *Muratorian Canon.*[2]

Professor Bacon's Theory.—A brief sketch of the latest theory as to the origin and authorship of the Gospel as formulated by Professor Bacon in his recent work will give us a clear idea of the trend of

[1] Schwartz, *Über den Tod der Sohne Zebedaei* (1904).

[2] The question of the tradition of the early death of John is very fully discussed in Moffatt, *op. cit.* pp. 602-613, and in Bacon, *op. cit.* chap v.

this particular type of criticism in relation to our subject.

1. *External Evidence.*—He sums up the character and relevance of the external evidence in these terms. There is a marked transformation in it about the year 160. Previous to this there is just enough of it to show the existence in Asia of a body of teaching like that found in the Fourth Gospel, with traces of the Johannine Epistles. Neither the Gospel nor the Epistles seem to be known outside Asia until about 152 A.D. and the employment of Gospel and Epistles, in mode and measure, falls far short of what we should expect of an Apostolic autograph. St. Paul, and not St. John, is the Apostolic authority whose doctrine and writings are appealed to.[1]

2. *The Origin and Growth of the Johannine Tradition.*—Tracing the origin of the Johannine tradition, he tells us that the source of it is to be found in the Apocalypse, and that its further course may be followed in the Johannine Epistles, and in the twenty-first chapter of the Gospel, which does not form an integral part of it, but is an appendix attached later to it. The true starting-point lies in the Apocalypse, which originally consisted of the central part only. This central portion is a Palestinian prophecy, to which the prologue of the *Letters to the Seven Churches* and the epilogue, containing the last chapters, were subsequently added. Now it is only in these later additions that the name of John as the author is mentioned. Both the prologue and the epilogue are due to an Ephesian editor, who ascribed the whole work to the Apostle in order to give the Palestinian prophecy currency and canonicity among the Churches

[1] Bacon, *op. cit.* pp. 153-157.

of Asia. This process is then predicated by Bacon with regard to the Fourth Gospel. It was originally published anonymously in Asia towards the close of the first century. Some years later the Epistles, containing a veiled ascription of the Gospel to St. John, are circulated as an epilogue, and the process is completed by the addition of the appendix in chap. xxi., which is attached to the Gospel itself, and contains a definite claim to the authorship on behalf of John, the son of Zebedee. In defence of this theory it is alleged that about 145–150 A.D. there began to grow in the Church the sense of the importance of duly authenticated documents, a striking illustration of which is found in Papias, who lays special stress on an evangelic tradition, established on a firm historical basis, and authenticated by transmission from the "Apostles and Elders," and who maintains the trustworthiness of the Apocalypse by the implied appeal to the authority of St. John.

The Asiatic canon of Scripture, consisting of Gospel, Epistles, and Prophecy, hitherto only known to proconsular Asia, now makes its appearance in a wider sphere, and appeals for recognition to the Church at large, on the strength of its alleged connection with the Apostle St. John. It is at this period, and with the deliberate object of making this recognition feasible, that the last chapter is added. The stage upon which the Gospel makes its appearance is Rome. Now Rome was already in possession of its threefold Gospel, and the authority of St. Peter was strong, and his memory was held in the greatest reverence. It was necessary, therefore, in order to ensure a cordial reception for the new arrival that there should be some readjustment in deference to

the dominant authority. In the Fourth Gospel, if we eliminate the appendix, the authority of St. Peter is placed in very marked subordination to that of the "disciple whom Jesus loved." At every critical period, whether at the first calling, the Supper, the following to Calvary, and even at the birth of the Resurrection faith, another steps in before St. Peter.

This marked subordination of St. Peter to the unnamed disciple might promote the circulation of the Gospel in Asia, but, unless it was modified, it would be well-nigh fatal to its acceptance in Rome, the see of Peter, or in Christendom at large. Hence the appendix, where full justice is done to St. Peter's position by the record of his complete restoration to favour, by the mention of his commission to the world, and by the prophecy of his martyrdom, presumably in Rome itself. In short, in the appendix Simon Peter takes the lead and is first in everything. The corresponding feature in the Gospel of St. Mark, where a later appendix has been added to the original Gospel, showing signs of a near approach to the Lucan tradition, is held to prove a similar process in regard to that Gospel in favour of the Lucan presentation.

3. *Opposition to the Recognition of the Gospel.*—It has been generally understood that the Johannine authorship was acknowledged universally from the year 170 downwards, and that, with the sole exception of an obscure sect, to whom Epiphanius gives the title of Alogi, there was practically no conflicting voice. But, according to the theory of Bacon which we are discussing, this was by no means so. He contends that the period between Justin Martyr, whose evidence in regard to the Gospel is

non-committal, and Irenaeus, whose assertion of its high authority is most conclusive, was marked at Rome by a series of controversies of the most serious character on this very question. Proof of this statement is alleged to be scattered broadcast throughout the writings of Eusebius. It would seem to be a fact that objections to the historicity and Apostolic authorship of the Gospel were actually put forward, and that they were based on its discrepancy with the Synoptists.

Eusebius in the chapter in which he treats of " the order of the Gospels " seems to be referring to this criticism, and offers his own explanation, in which he states that the " Gospel according to St. John contains the first acts of Christ while the others give an account of the latter part of his life." [1]

Irenaeus also speaks of those who " do not admit that form which is according to St. John's Gospel," [2] and here the reference is apparently to those who refused to receive the extravagant and fanatical claims to prophetic gifts made by the Montanists and others, which claims were based to a large extent on what they professed to find in the Fourth Gospel.

Philaster again speaks of opposition to the Gospel on the part of those who asserted that both the Gospel and the Apocalypse were the work of the arch-heretic Cerinthus.[3]

Our knowledge of the opposition of the sect called " Alogi," so called " because they do not receive the Logos preached by John," [4] we owe to Epiphanius. They were probably the same body as those referred to by Philaster, because they also

[1] Eusebius, *H.E.* vol. iii. 24.
[2] Irenaeus, *Haer.* vol. xi. 9.
[3] Philaster, *De Haer.* 60.
[4] Epiphanius, *Haer.* 51.

attributed the Gospel to Cerinthus. This was probably due to the fact that it was held in high favour by the Valentinians and the followers of Basilides, which led a section of narrow-minded Christians to ascribe it entirely to a Gnostic source.

Connected with the Alogi, perhaps their leader, was one Gaius, a Roman Christian, who criticised and disparaged the Gospel on account of its marked divergences from the other Gospels. It is now maintained that the *Heads against Gaius*,[1] a work mentioned by an early Christian writer, Ebed-Jesu, was none other than the *Defence of the Gospel according to St. John and the Apocalypse*, which is one of the works of Hippolytus named in the list on the back of his chair which is still preserved in the Lateran Museum at Rome, and that this was the work used by Epiphanius in compiling the section on the Alogi. If this identification is correct, it would show that the opposition of Gaius was considered to be of sufficient importance to extract from Hippolytus a large work in order to demolish his arguments. Rendel Harris and E. A. Abbott support the identification, while Stanton is strongly opposed to it.[2] It was then only after a long period of controversy, according to Bacon, that the Gospel was fully accepted and attained to a position of undoubted authority as an integral part of the Fourfold Gospel. Echoes of the controversy are found in Irenaeus, and the question had not passed beyond the sphere of controversy even in his day. This explains why he employed all his imagination and all his persuasive powers in order to have the matter settled beyond all dispute. In the

[1] Published by J. Gwynn in *Hermathena*, vol. vi. pp. 397-418.

[2] Stanton, *op. cit.* Additional Note, p. 239 f.

Muratorian fragment of the Canon, again, according to Zahn, who is a strong supporter of the traditional view, "the discussion of the Gospel and 1 St. John bears an unmistakably apologetic character." [1]

4. *Internal Evidence.*—The following is the account which the latest theory gives us of the purpose of the Evangelist and of his identity. The Gospel was written for a Greek-speaking, Gentile, Pauline Church, and is based on the great Christological principles of the Pauline Epistles, Spirit and Life. It belongs essentially to the Pauline succession of documents, and is saturated with Pauline ideas. It is the last of the line beginning with Galatians and passing through Romans and the Ephesian-Colossian group until it reaches its climax in this Gospel. The author was undoubtedly a disciple of St. Paul who lived at Ephesus. Much of the internal evidence points to the fact that the omissions, supplements, changes, and substitutions are not those of a better informed eye-witness, but the historical reconstructions of a later theologian, intent on bringing out the religious, doctrinal, or apologetic values on the basis of the spiritual Gospel of St. Paul. It is allowed that the author was a Jew, not necessarily a Jew of Palestine, but of the Western Dispersion, and it is alleged that his knowledge of localities, on which so much stress is laid by the supporters of the Johannine authorship, is confined to Jerusalem and its environs and the beaten track between Jerusalem and Galilee. Once he leaves the high road, his information is exceedingly meagre and occasionally misleading. All this is to show that the knowledge that the author possessed

[1] Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. iii. p. 179.

was quite compatible with only an occasional visit to the Holy Land as a pilgrim.[1]

Moffatt's views as expressed in his *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, pp. 567-570, are much to the same effect. Speaking of the authorship of the Gospel, he tells us that it makes no statement about its author, and that the claim in chap. xxi. 23 is not made by the author himself, but by the anonymous circle who endorse the Gospel, and who have added to it two closing notes (xxi. 24-25), both of which indicate that the Gospel had been, or might be, expected to be criticised for its unique contents, so different from the Synoptic tradition, and for its incompleteness. He is also of opinion that, unless John the Presbyter is brought in, the author of St. John chaps. i.-xx., and the editor who revised it and added two appendices, are both unknown, and that the former, like the writer of St. Matthew's Gospel, was one of the anonymous early Christian writers who were content to sink their names in their great cause and subject.

The John upon whose existence the whole Johannine tradition is based is not John the Apostle, but John the Elder, who must have lived to a great age in Asia Minor, and who became an authority there. He was a Jewish Christian disciple, originally a Jerusalemite, who taught and ruled with strictness in the local Churches of Asia Minor, and whose authority and influence created a "Johannine school and circle." He wrote the Apocalypse, and two notes of his have survived (2 and 3 St. John). Later on the Church looked back to see in him and in his earlier Apostolic namesake not two stars but one.

[1] The foregoing compressed epitome of the views of Bacon is taken from chaps. vi.-x. in Bacon, *op. cit.*

The Odes of Solomon and their Significance in Regard to the Date of St. John.—The discovery and publication of the Syriac MS. of the *Odes of Solomon* in 1909, by Rendel Harris, may prove of great importance in helping to decide the question of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. Much has been made by the opponents of the Johannine authorship of the fact that the Gospel is thoroughly Alexandrian in spirit and phraseology, and could not therefore be the work of a Jew of Palestine. Harris himself describes the Odes as Christian and as dating from the last quarter of the first century. Harnack [1] believes them to be of Jewish origin edited by a Christian. They reflect an aspect of Christian thought which has hitherto been represented by the Johannine writings, and they remove the Johannine thought about Jesus from that isolated position it has hitherto been regarded as occupying. It proves that there is more Judaism than Hellenism in the Johannine Theology.

"They bear no traces whatsoever of Hellenic speculative thought and they prove that ideas like Light, Life, Truth, Knowledge, Immortality are not Hellenic but Jewish. The same mystical element as we find in the Johannine writings appears in them. Harnack emphasises the fact that the Odes prove that in the Johannine theology, apart from the prologue, there is nothing essentially Hellenic, and, therefore, that a large part of the supposed Alexandrian element in the Fourth Gospel is really Jewish. If this is true a great many arguments for a second-century date and a large number of objections to the Johannine authorship cease to have any validity." [2]

[1] Harnack, "A Jewish Christian Psalm Book of the First Century" (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, iii. 5. 4, 1910).

[2] See Strachan, *Expository Times* (1911), pp. 7-14.

SUMMARY.—I have confined myself in this chapter to the task of giving, as far as possible, a fair and unbiassed exposition of the views and opinions of the protagonists in this all-important controversy, and I have refrained from obtruding any views of my own with the exception of an occasional comment here and there. I have pursued this course deliberately, because to me the authorship of the Fourth Gospel is still an unsolved problem. The difficulties in the way of accepting the conclusions of either party to the discussion are very considerable. The case against the Johannine authorship has been stated by Professor Bacon with the greatest skill and eloquence, and his marshalling of the evidence is masterly. He has covered the ground so carefully and completely that it is difficult to imagine what more can be said in defence of his view. And yet I am not convinced. The practically unanimous tradition of the Christian Church from the year 170 downwards, the strong evidence which the document itself furnishes as to the identity of its author, the character of the Gospel which reveals the very mind and soul of the Master in a manner that is not approached by any other New Testament book, all these appeal with an all but irresistible force, and compel us to think once, twice, nay a hundred times, before we deprive it of its Apostolic author. But greatest of all the difficulties in the way of accepting the opposite conclusion is that no satisfactory answer is given to the question, "If St. John did not write the Fourth Gospel, who wrote it?" The critics are at variance with one another on this all-important point. Harnack suggests John the Presbyter, Moffatt says that this is possible but by no means probable,

while Bacon rejects the suggestion with all the scorn that he is capable of. Yet it seems almost impossible to conceive that the writer of a book of the unique character and sublimity of this Gospel could have produced such a book and then entirely disappeared from history, as he must have done if the theory of the modern critic is accepted. After weighing all the arguments very carefully I must confess that the authorship of the Fourth Gospel still remains for me an open question, but that what little bias I may have is on the side of St. John.

CHAPTER IX

THE JOHANNINE LITERATURE (*contd.*)

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

THE question of the historical value of the Fourth Gospel, although bearing some relation to the problem of the authorship, is not inseparably connected with it. If it were possible to produce incontrovertible proof that the Gospel was written by St. John the Apostle, this would unquestionably strengthen the position of those who find in the Gospel a transcript of actual historical events, but it would not settle the matter beyond all dispute. It would still be conceivable that the Apostle, writing at the close of a long and pregnant life and looking back upon the past in the light of his enhanced knowledge of Christ and of his ripe experience of the world and of men, might have been more concerned with the interpretation of the event than with the event itself, and might have realised that the idea was more valuable than the fact. Indeed some of the most strenuous supporters of the Johannine authorship, as *e.g.* Dr. Drummond, are by no means convinced of the definite historicity of the Gospel. On the other hand, to say that the Gospel is not the work of the Apostle is in no way tantamount to saying that it possesses no historical value. A Christian disciple, writing towards the end

of the first century, might well have had at his disposal documents of the most authentic and trustworthy character belonging to an earlier generation, and might, therefore, have produced a historical work of the first rank. In this respect he would only have followed in the footsteps of St. Luke, whose claim to the production of a historical document is only based on the fact that he has brought to bear upon materials already in existence the mind, discretion, and insight of the true historian. The subject of the present chapter, the historicity of the Gospel, is, therefore, not altogether dependent upon the question of the authorship, and must be decided on other grounds.

Again, it is not enough to say that the question is raised purely because of the theological prepossessions of those who presume to doubt the strict historicity of the Gospel. The problem presents itself to every earnest and thoughtful reader of the book and lies patent on its very surface.

The Contrast between the Synoptic Record and that of St. John.—It requires no deep theological knowledge, or critical insight, or even a sceptical temperament to discover the startling differences between the Fourth Gospel and the three which immediately precede it. To pass from the study of the latter to the former is to experience nothing less than an absolute change of theological and historical climate, and a transference to an entirely different plane of thought. A few details will serve to substantiate this statement. Instead of a plain, simple narrative, accompanied by little in the way of comment, we are lifted at once to the contemplation of eternal thoughts. The birth stories and genealogies of the earlier record are replaced by the heavenly procession of the

Eternal Logos from the Divine Father. Instead of the homely life and trade of Nazareth and Capernaum we find ourselves listening to elaborate discussions in the Temple courts, and the practical simplicity of the Sermon on the Mount gives way to the mystical and exalted language of the farewell discourses. Many of the main characters in the drama are either new, or endowed with an importance which was not theirs before. Nathanael, Nicodemus, Lazarus, the impotent man, and the man born blind are introduced here for the first time, while Thomas starts into unfamiliar prominence. The Synoptists place the chief scene of the Ministry in Galilee, but in St. John Jerusalem becomes the centre of interest, and the period covered by the Ministry is extended from one year to three. Many important incidents are omitted altogether. There is no explicit mention of the Virgin Birth, of our Lord's Baptism, Temptation, Transfiguration, and the Agony in the Garden and Ascension are not so much as referred to. Other conspicuous narratives are placed in an entirely new setting, as *e.g.* the Cleansing of the Temple and the Call of the Disciples, and this would appear to be true in the case of the Eucharistic teaching.

The contrast becomes most striking, however, when we come to consider our Lord's teaching as set forth in this Gospel. He is no longer the wonderful teacher and healer, or the prophet, but the Eternal and revealed Son of God. The Kingdom of God, which in the Synoptic Gospels is the central subject of His teaching, has practically no place here, and attention is concentrated on the Person of Christ, His Eternal attributes, His pre-existence, His mission to reveal the Divine Father and through His own humanity to

lift men into fellowship with God. He speaks no longer in parable or maxim, but in long discourses on transcendent themes, and great abstract conceptions such as life, light, witness, flesh, glory, grace, truth have displaced the simple ethical teaching based on nature and human relations which fills the preceding Gospels. Miracles are no longer actions dictated by mercy and loving-kindness towards a sorrow-stricken and sin-laden humanity, but are signs of overwhelming significance, destined to reveal the glory of God and the Majesty of the Divine Son. Most significant of all is the contrast between the Synoptic representation of the gradual development of the consciousness of His Messianic claims on the part of the disciples as compared with the immediate and absolute recognition of His Divine prerogatives which meets us in St. John from the very first.[1]

The Problem and its Solution.—The problem, then, with which we are confronted may be stated in some such terms as these. We have in the New Testament four documents, each one of them having a distinct character of its own, and all of them having this feature in common, that they profess to tell a story of the life of Christ. The first three, in spite of differences of detail here and there, are so closely related to each other that they clearly belong to the same literary family, and the picture they give of our Lord's life and work is in each case of such a character that we have no difficulty in recognising that they are telling substantially the same story and portraying the one and the same life. The same point of view is common to all three, and the material employed

[1] The differences between the Synoptic record and that of St. John in relation to the life and teaching of Christ are worked out with great fulness by Schmiedel in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. ii. cols. 2518-2536.

by all three is, generally speaking, of the same texture. But when we come to the fourth document, which is also concerned with the life-story of Christ, we are suddenly brought face to face with a picture which, to the superficial observer at any rate, is to all intents and purposes that of a different Christ. The points that we have enumerated in the preceding paragraph enable us to realise to what extent this impression is justified. Again, the story as told by the Synoptists makes the stronger appeal to the historic sense. It gives an account of our Lord's life and teaching which is natural and life-like, and bears on its surface strong evidence of the narrative of the eye-witness. It is a story which, at the first approach, carries conviction with it, and commends itself as giving a true picture of Jesus of Nazareth as He lived and moved among men. If the Synoptic portrait of our Lord is historic and authentic, what are we to say of the corresponding portrait as drawn by the fourth Evangelist ?

Now, speaking broadly, there are two methods of dealing with this problem. First of all there is the solution offered by the Church for close upon eighteen centuries, which, while making due acknowledgment of considerable differences of detail between the two presentations, regarded both the one and the other as historic. Difficulties there undoubtedly were in harmonising the two conceptions, but none that were not capable of satisfactory explanation, and certainly none of such vital importance as to endanger in any way the historical truth of St. John's Gospel. When we find associated with this view such names as those of Lightfoot and Westcott in the immediate past and of Sanday and Zahn among living scholars we are

bound to regard it with considerable respect, and it certainly cannot be dismissed lightly or off-handedly. The other solution is that in favour with the majority of Continental critics like Harnack, Schmiedel, and Loisy, and with E. A. Abbott and Burkitt in our own country, who maintain that the Gospel is theology and not history, poetry and not prose.

Harnack sums up his view of the question in the following words : " The Fourth Gospel which does not come from the Apostle John, and does not profess to do so, cannot be used as a historical source in the ordinary sense of those words. The author acted with autocratic freedom, transposed events and placed them in an unwonted light, composed discourses at his own will, and illustrated lofty thoughts by imagined situations. Hence his work, though not wholly wanting in the elements of a genuine if hardly recognisable tradition, can hardly at any point be taken into account as a source for the history of Jesus ; it is but little that we can take over from him, and even that only with circumspection." [1]

Schmiedel speaks of the Gospel in this strain : " We have to deal with a writer from whom we can neither demand strict historical accuracy nor have any occasion to do so. The task the author deemed to be laid upon him by the nature of the circumstances was that of giving expression to his deep ideas in the form of a life of Jesus." " One discerns in the Gospel the ripest fruit of primitive Christianity—the ripest, if also the furthest removed from the original." " The worth of the Fourth Gospel does not lie in the accuracy of its details regarding the life of Jesus nor yet in the character of the total

[1] Harnack, *What is Christianity ?* p. 13.

picture it presents, but it is more to be found in the ideas by which it is dominated." [1]

The point of view of Loisy and Schmiedel is partially explained by the phrase *entweder—oder* (either —or), which indicates that, if we desire to reconstruct the Ministry of Jesus, we must make our choice between the Synoptic record and the narrative in St. John. The two conceptions are from the point of view of history irreconcilable, and, as in all points which in substance are common to the four documents, the Synoptists everywhere excel in simplicity, naturalness, and intelligibility, there can be no hesitation as to the object of our choice. The Synoptic story may be incomplete, but it is all that we have upon which we can safely rely. The Fourth Gospel belongs entirely to the second or third generation, and has no material which goes back to the actual life of Jesus of Nazareth on earth save what the author learnt from the Synoptists and has transformed to suit his own views and the needs of later generations. Mr. Burkitt's criticism in his fascinating book on *The Gospel History and its Transmission* is much on the same lines as that of Schmiedel in relation to this particular point.

In these two methods of dealing with the problem we have the views of what one may call the orthodox and the modern wings of scholarship set forth. But, in this case, as in so many other similar discussions, I cannot help thinking that the real solution is to be found somewhere midway between the two extremes, and that here again a compromise between the two rival theories best meets the needs of the situation. That the Fourth Gospel is not historical in the sense or degree which we attribute to the Synoptists does

[1] Schmiedel, *Ency. Bibl.* vol. ii. cols. 2554, 2558.

not seem to call for any elaborate proof; but, on the other hand, to assert that it is a mere theological or metaphysical treatise with facts and discourses invented to prove the author's thesis is certainly not justified by the contents of the Gospel. The conclusion that the solution of the problem is to be sought, not in a rigid adherence to either of the extreme theories, but by adopting a mediating position between the two, is increasingly finding favour with modern scholars, and will be found set forth with great force in Mr. Brooke's essay on the "Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel" in the *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, in Dr. Armitage Robinson's *Study of the Gospels*, and in Mr. E. F. Scott's *The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology*, all of which I have found extremely helpful in compiling this chapter, and to the last of which I am very largely indebted for much of the material it contains.

The Conditions under which the Gospel was written and their Influence upon its Character.—To arrive at a true conception of St. John's Gospel, its purpose and character, it is essential to know something of the special conditions governing the particular period at which it was written.

Reference has already been made to the fact that there is a fairly wide agreement among all but the most extreme critics that we shall not be far wrong if we assign to the Gospel a date somewhere about the end of the first or the beginning of the second century, *i.e.* between the years 90 and 110 A.D. For a proper understanding of the Gospel and its content it is necessary to realise the immense importance of these two decades in the history of the Church. Of the great critical epochs in the Church's career this was

by no means the least significant, and a book of any real weight, concerned with the needs and problems which were then occupying the minds of Christian men, may be fairly expected to manifest within its pages some signs of the characteristic influences which were at work when it was written.

Among the factors which contributed to the importance of this period in the life of the Christian Church we may note the following :

1. *It was an Age of Transition from the Apostolic to the Sub-Apostolic Period.*—The Church had hitherto been under the guidance of Apostles or of Apostolic men, most of whom had been in varying degrees in contact with the life and earthly Ministry of Christ. Their work and their message had to a considerable extent been conditioned by the expectation of the near return of our Lord to judgment. The Jews and Jewish proselytes had been a very important, if not actually the primary, factor in the constitution of local Churches, and, although Christianity was now widely diffused throughout the Empire, the approach to the Gentile world had been made mainly through the medium of the Synagogue and of the " God-fearing " Gentile. But now all this was undergoing a process of transformation. The Apostles and their immediate successors were all passing away, if they had not actually done so, although it is quite conceivable that in the writer of this Gospel we possess the last living link which bound the Church of the close of the first century to the historic life of the Master. It was now being increasingly realised that the end was not yet, that the coming of Christ was not to be looked for in the near future, and that the Church had an all-important mission to fulfil towards the

world that lay open to its message. The severance between the Church and Judaism was all but complete, and the former had now to make its appeal direct to the great Gentile world, unsupported and untrammelled by the forces of the latter.

2. *It was an Age of Transition to a Different Culture.*—The Christian Gospel had hitherto been presented in a form which was fundamentally Jewish. The strongest influences even in St. Paul, the most cosmopolitan of all the Apostolic leaders, had been the Old Testament and the Judaism of his early years, and his central doctrines were conceived on the lines of Old Testament theology and Jewish eschatology. But if Christianity was to become the religion of the Graeco-Roman world, the process, of which we detect the beginnings in St. Paul, must be carried forward to its completion, and the religion of Christ must abandon the narrow limits of Jewish modes of thought and expression, and must adapt itself to meet the needs of the Gentile world which was now Hellenistic in spirit and philosophic in thought.

3. The most important factor of all was that *Christianity could no longer continue as a religion based on the mere outward fact of a knowledge of Christ in the flesh.* The knowledge of Christ which was the endowment of the Church of the last decade of the first century was no longer that of the primitive Church, but knowledge which was essentially the product of religious experience. This transformation was accompanied by two dangers to Christianity:

(*a*) That it would evaporate into a philosophy.

(*b*) That it might petrify into a mechanical tradition.[1]

[1] Scott, *op. cit.* p. 8.

Let us now see *in what way* and *to what extent these conditions have affected the character of the Fourth Gospel.*

1. The Gospel shows unmistakable signs of the development of the Christian message during the first century of its history.

The eschatological teaching of the primitive Church has been changed into an inward mystical experience, and the Parousia is no longer placed on the clouds of Heaven, but in the hearts of believers. Again, the influence of St. Paul is everywhere apparent, and the Gospel is largely indebted to him for most of its central conceptions. The Johannine teaching on the love of God, union with Christ, and on life in relation to the glorified Christ is a development of germs already present in the Pauline doctrine. To these we may add the influence of Alexandrian Judaism, which had already made its entrance into Christian literature in the Epistle to the Hebrews, a treatise that bridges the gulf between St. Paul and St. John. Alexandrian thought occupies a more important place here than in the Epistle, because the effect of Philo on the modes of Christian presentations is now felt for the first time to any appreciable degree. Finally, the presence of heresies, principally of a semi-Gnostic character, has left its mark upon the vocabulary and ideas of the Gospel. The result of these many influences is seen in its breadth of view, which is foreign to the Christian literature of the earlier generation. Christ is now invested with a grandeur which is only beginning to be realised by the Christian consciousness, and in His words are discovered depths of meaning which had not been revealed to the minds of previous writers and thinkers.

15652

2. To meet the demands of the Graeco-Roman world, to which Christianity is now mainly directed, the Synoptic Messianic idea, which was Jewish in its origin and character, and, therefore, national and limited, is replaced by the "Logos" conception, already a doctrine of the Stoics, and utilised by Philo in his attempt to reconcile Greek philosophy with the Old Testament. St. Paul had previously recognised that the Jewish Messianic idea did not fully represent the significance of Jesus, and in the Epistles of the Imprisonment we find him reaching out towards a higher conception of the Person of Christ. The process reaches its climax in St. John's Gospel and in the doctrine of the "Logos." Christ is presented under an aspect which has entirely outgrown the narrow limits of Judaism, and the Gospel makes its appeal to a Hellenic world in a form and under a mode which it can both understand and appreciate.

3. We have referred to the danger which threatened Christianity while it was being transformed from a religion in which the outward knowledge of Christ had become of necessity displaced by the inward experience of Him. This danger was twofold in character. First of all Christianity might develop on the lines of current Greek thought and become a philosophy devoid of any real power. On the other hand, it might deteriorate into a mere lifeless tradition, content with the recollections and privileges of the past, and making no serious effort to adapt itself to become a world-wide power and force. St. John sets himself to counteract both these dangerous tendencies. To meet the second danger he presents the life of Jesus in its eternal meaning, and is insistent upon the fact that discipleship is still possible to those

who had not seen and yet had believed, and, furthermore, that the inward fellowship with Christ is more intimate and more real than that which is based on mere outward knowledge of Him. At the same time, to prevent the religion of Christ being transformed into a philosophy pure and simple he rigidly combines the "Logos" doctrine with the historic Jesus. The Christ whom he clothes in all the glory that language can express, the Christ whose power and grace are inwardly experienced by the believer, is no abstract ideal, but the very Master who lived and walked in the flesh. In this respect the Fourth Gospel is of incomparable value in view of modern attempts to dissociate the ideals and spirit of Christianity from the historic and living Christ, which have been described in previous chapters.[1]

The Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptists.—It has already been stated that the historical value of the Fourth Gospel is challenged mainly on the ground of the divergences in its representation of the life, work, and teaching of Christ from that we have been familiarised with in the Synoptic Gospels.

A brief discussion of the relation of this Gospel to its three predecessors is necessary, therefore, if we are to understand the basis underlying this challenge.

This relationship will be discussed with reference to—

1. *The coincidences between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists.*

2. *The additions to the Synoptists found in the Fourth Gospel.*

3. *The omissions in the Fourth Gospel of material found in the Synoptists.*

[1] See Book I. Chaps. III. and IV.

1. *The Coincidences.*—It is quite clear that the Fourth Gospel presupposes the Synoptic tradition, and it is fairly generally agreed that the author has made use of all the Synoptic Gospels. There may be a certain amount of hesitation necessary in making this assertion concerning the Third Gospel, and it is strongly urged by some scholars that the repeated similarities of style and statement in the two Gospels are not due to the direct dependence of the Fourth upon the Third, but are rather to be explained by the dependence of both upon a common source.[1] We shall not go far wrong, however, if we assume an acquaintance with all the three Gospels on the part of St. John. It is necessary before we proceed further to emphasise a feature which is in reality common to all the four Gospels, but is often defined as being peculiar to the Fourth Gospel, viz. that in every Gospel there is a tendency to interpret and reflect upon the evangelic traditions in the light of later Christian consciousness. It cannot be said of any one of the Gospels that it is a purely objective chronicle of events which find their spiritual interpretation in the Fourth Gospel. In St. Mark, the very earliest of them, the presence of the element of interpretation is manifest, and all that can be fairly said of the Fourth Gospel in this respect is that a further and special phase of this tendency is to be found in it.[2]

St. John has, like his two immediate predecessors, adopted the framework of St. Mark's narrative, but often in matters of detail diverges from it in favour of St. Matthew and St. Luke. Thus our Lord's Ministry is preceded by that of the Baptist's and His public work is inaugurated by a miracle in Galilee.

[1] Moffat, *op. cit.* p. 534. [2] *Ibid.* p. 540.

The Ministry, which opens with gladness and promise, gradually changes its character, and the joy and the brightness give place to the bitterness of debate and controversy, which reaches its climax in the discussions of the last week in Jerusalem. In the Passion Story the sequence of St. Mark is closely followed. But his following of the Synoptists does not go much beyond the framework, and he has filled this in in a manner all his own. The Ministry may begin in Galilee, but the scene is immediately afterwards removed to Jerusalem and remains there. The special Jewish parties, the Pharisees and Sadducees, become the Jews at large. He deals with the events of the Synoptic narrative by a method of selection, and this selection is made with a definite purpose and on an elaborate plan, in which the numbers 3 and 7 play an important part. It is also quite apparent that in dealing with the events of the Ministry the Evangelist's mind is not set upon the events as facts, but as symbols of religious ideas. Thus the Miracles, of which he has selected the symbolical number seven, are not mere acts of mercy and beneficence, but " signs " pointing to some truth beyond themselves, and in almost every case the account of the miracle is followed by a lengthy discourse in which this truth is expounded. To St. John the fact itself is of little interest compared with the spiritual idea of which the fact is the mere adumbration. It is in this direction that we probably have to seek for an explanation of the Evangelist's comparative independence of the historical narrative as recorded in the Synoptists.

2. *Additions.*—There are considerable sections of the Fourth Gospel to which there are no parallels in

the Synoptic narrative. Thus, the first three Gospels are absolutely silent as to the miracle at Cana, the conversations with Nicodemus and with the Woman of Samaria, the healing of the paralytic at Bethesda, and the raising of Lazarus. Now the Synoptists do not claim to give a complete, or anything like a complete, account of our Lord's Ministry, and it has been estimated that all the incidents recorded in them would not cover more than forty days, whereas it must have lasted, at the lowest computation, more than four hundred days. There seems no difficulty, therefore, even if we set aside the Johannine authorship, in believing that the Evangelist may have had access to documents not utilised by the Synoptists, or that he may have been acquainted with a stream of oral tradition which was not within reach of the other Evangelists, and that in these documents, or embedded in the stream of oral tradition, he may have found this additional material. Furthermore, it is by no means inconceivable that some of these characters and incidents, which appear presumably for the first time in the Fourth Gospel, are not as independent of the Synoptic tradition as may appear at first sight. Some of them have a suspicious likeness to similar characters and incidents which are found in the Synoptic narrative. It is not very difficult to identify the Nicodemus with the young ruler in Mark x. 17 = Matt. xix. 16. Echoes of the miracle in Cana may possibly be found in Mark ii. 19, 22, " Can the sons of the bridechamber fast while the bridegroom is with them," and the story of the paralytic looks like a variant of the healing of the " man sick of the palsy " at Capernaum. The discussion of the narrative of the raising of Lazarus will be deferred until we come

to deal with the real difficulties of the Gospel from the point of view of its historical truth.

3. *The Omissions.*—Another feature which marks the divergence of the Fourth from the other Gospels is the omission of several crucial incidents which are found in the latter. There is no reference in it to the Temptation, Transfiguration, the Institution of the Eucharist, the Agony in the Garden, or the Ascension, and there is no room found in it for a single Parable. How is the omission of such significant Synoptic material as this to be explained? The explanation undoubtedly lies in St. John's characteristic conception of Christ. When we have once realised the true purpose of the Fourth Gospel and understood the impression it sought to make upon the Church in regard to the Person of Christ, all difficulty in connection with these omissions vanishes. The Christology of the Gospel is based largely upon that of St. Paul, but is an advance upon it. St. Paul had been content to ignore, to some considerable extent, the earthly life and Ministry of Jesus in his desire to emphasise the eternal meaning of the Christian revelation. The one object of his faith was the Christ who was once obedient to the death of the Cross, but was now raised from the dead and exalted to the right hand of God. This tendency to overemphasise the exalted, ever-living Christ was not without its dangerous side, and there were already signs of a trend of thought in which the identity of the Christ of faith with the historical Jesus was beginning to be loosely held, and, as a consequence, the earthly life and work of Jesus were being emptied of much of their value and purpose. This was the direction which the semi-Gnostic and Docetic heresies of the period took, and a doctrine of

Christ was gaining ground which had little or no relation to the historical life. The main purpose of St. John is to reconcile the Pauline account with that of the Synoptists. He goes back to Jesus as He had actually lived among men. The real humanity of Jesus is emphasised in this Gospel as it is in no other Christian document. Yet this truly human Jesus is inseparably joined to the Eternal Word, and is invested with all the glory of the Eternal Christ whom Paul had beheld in vision. Jesus in His human intercourse with His disciples is none other than "the Son of God who is in Heaven." It is this conception of Jesus as the "Son of God" which explains the omission of such incidents as the Baptism, Temptation, and the Agony in the Garden. These might be interpreted to imply weakness or subordination in the Master, and might, therefore, be derogatory to the Divine power and Majesty of the Incarnate Word. The story of the Transfiguration is omitted because there was no room for an incidental Transfiguration where the whole life was one continued Transfiguration. There is no Ascension in the Gospel because Jesus had never ceased to be the Eternal Son, and there could, therefore, be no necessity for a return to the Father.

The Discourses in the Fourth Gospel.—We now approach a phase of our subject which is attended by considerable difficulties, viz. the discourses in the Gospel. In no section of the book is the contrast between it and the Synoptists more marked than in the records of our Lord's teaching. This is true of its method, style, and substance. In the discourses of the Fourth Gospel Christ speaks in a language which has apparently no parallel in the other Gospels.

The Parable, which is practically the one and only medium of instruction in the Synoptic record, has entirely disappeared, and instead of it we find long speeches, which are often only strings of aphorisms, repeated and expanded,[1] and composed in such a manner as to make it difficult to decide where the words of our Lord end and those of the Evangelist begin. The style of the discourses is also that of the narrative itself, and it is a style that is by no means peculiar to Christ's utterances. Nathanael, Nicodemus, Mary and Martha all speak in the same strain. It is quite apparent, therefore, that, even though we grant that the foundation of the teaching may be our Lord's, the phraseology and the particular form which it assumes in this Gospel are the Evangelist's.

Our difficulties increase when we come to consider the substance of Christ's teaching as given in this Gospel. There is practically no mention of the Kingdom of God, which in the Synoptic Gospels is the very centre of His doctrine. The Fatherhood of God, the moral truths which occupy the place of honour in the Sermon on the Mount, and the Parables are conspicuous by their absence. Here the revelation of Christ centres wholly upon Himself, and attention is exclusively drawn to His own Person. Many attempts have been made from time to time to explain this phenomenon, but few of them are quite satisfactory. The conclusion that the discourses are the product of free invention, which is the solution suggested by some modern critics, does not seem to fit in with our conception of the character of the Gospel or Evangelist.

[1] Sanday, *op. cit.* p. 167.

Another suggestion frequently offered is that the author is here drawing upon an independent tradition now lost. It is possible that there may have been from the first a twofold double-sided strain in our Lord's teaching, each of which would appeal to a definite class of mind, and that it is only by blending the Synoptists with the Fourth Gospel that we arrive at a complete and accurate conception of the teaching of Christ.

Armitage Robinson[1] puts forth some such explanation as the above to account for the striking difference between the recognition and confession of the Messiahship as represented in the Synoptic and Johannine traditions respectively. In the former the confession of the Messiahship is a climax gradually reached, and reached as the effect of the impression the life of Jesus left upon the minds of His disciples. St. John, on the other hand, does not reason from the outward actions to the Person behind them. He assumes from the very first that Jesus was the Christ, and construes the history in the light of this assumption. At the outset the Baptist speaks of Jesus as "the Lamb of God" and as "the Son of God," and Andrew says, "We have found the Messiah."

Dr. Robinson suggests that the divergence may be due to two methods of teaching pursued among populations so severed and so diverse as those of Galilee and Judaea. To the simple ignorant folk of Galilee Jesus might appeal as the wonderful healer and teacher, or as one of the prophets, and nothing more. He would endeavour to win men to trust Him for that they found Him to be, to listen to His message of the Heavenly Father's care, to come to Him for

[1] Armitage Robinson, *Study of the Gospels*, pp. 135-145.

rest. It would be different in Jerusalem, the centre of Rabbinic influence and the home of religious controversy, where the question, "Who art Thou?" could not be postponed. The difference between the two strains of teaching would thus be explained upon the assumption that St. Mark, upon whose Gospel the Synoptic tradition is based, was chiefly concerned with our Lord's Galilean Ministry, while St. John concentrated his attention upon His presence and teaching in Jerusalem.

Another, and perhaps the most satisfactory solution, is that we have already adopted with regard to the fresh incidents in this Gospel, viz. that the discourses are ultimately based on Synoptic material. There are few Johannine utterances to which parallels are not available in the other Gospels. What St. John has done is to expand, change the emphasis, and restate the actual words in order to bring out more fully the inward idea. The discourse with Nicodemus affords a good illustration of his method of dealing with Synoptic material. The foundation of the discourse is probably to be sought in St. Matt. xviii. 3, "Except ye be converted and become as little children ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." In St. John the process has only been antedated by one stage, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God." It is interesting to note that Justin Martyr in his *First Apology* actually quotes the words of Matthew when referring to the New Birth.[1] The form of the conversation with Nicodemus was also no doubt determined in part by the importance attached to Baptism at the time when the Gospel was written. With reference to the

[1] See p. 368.

Johannine teaching concerning the Person of Christ the Evangelist is here again simply interpreting the Synoptic representation. It is true that in the earlier Gospels Jesus says little about Himself, but behind all the teaching there stands the authority of the Person. The significant phrase, "Verily I say," is the ultimate sanction of each commandment. The main purpose of the Synoptists is to reproduce the impression Christ made on men, and in St. John the underlying purpose becomes explicit. Sayings like "I am the Light of the World," "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," have no direct parallels in the Synoptic Gospels, but these phrases only express openly what is implied in those Gospels.

Points in which the Fourth Gospel definitely disagrees with the Synoptists.—We now come to deal with certain features wherein the Fourth Gospel is directly at variance with the other three.

The most important of these are :

1. The length of the Ministry.
2. The number of the visits to Jerusalem.
3. The date of the Crucifixion.

These points are so fully discussed in all works concerned with the criticism of St. John's Gospel that it is only necessary to mention here that, in all these three instances, the historical value of St. John would seem to be superior to that of the Synoptists. The authority for a Ministry, covering little more than a year and including only one visit to Jerusalem, is Mark, because the other two Gospels have only repeated his general scheme and sequence of events, and have not dealt independently with questions of time and locality. Hence the issue is confined to a choice between the accounts in St. Mark and St. John.

Now the evidence of the Gospels as a whole is certainly in favour of a Ministry wider than that recorded in St. Mark. The second document employed by Matthew and Luke (Q) contains significant allusions to a wider activity, and the Synoptists themselves imply other visits to Jerusalem besides the one explicitly mentioned, which ended in the tragedy of Calvary.

With respect to the date of the Crucifixion opinion is slowly but surely turning in favour of the Johannine date, which means that our Lord was crucified, not on the fifteenth, but on the fourteenth of Nisan, and that the Eucharist was, therefore, instituted not on the night of the Passover, but on the night before. It is well to bear these instances in mind when we estimate the historical value of the Fourth Gospel.

Some Points of Real Difficulty.—Before I close this discussion it is necessary to deal with two or three features in the Gospel which are open to serious criticism, and the historicity of which would seem to be somewhat dubious.

1. *Polemical Elements.*—Earlier in the chapter attention was directed to the part played in defining the character and content of the Gospel by the peculiar conditions under which it was written.

In this connection it is manifest that some of the prominent features of the Gospel bear a living relationship to the circumstances and conditions of the age which produced it, and that the author is more concerned with the controversies and heresies which were prevalent towards the close of the first century than with the actual discussions which took place during our Lord's Ministry.

The internal evidence within the Gospel itself

enables us to identify a polemical element which is directed against three different sets of opponents.

(*a*) *The Controversy with the Jews.*—The Scribes and Pharisees of the Synoptic Gospels and their opposition to Jesus have given way to the Jews and to the hostility of the Jewish nation as a whole. Now this may give a true impression of the state of affairs at the time when the Gospel was written, when the Jews as a nation were the active enemies of the Christian Church, but it is hardly in accordance with our knowledge of the conditions that prevailed during our Lord's earthly life. The Christ of St. John in his relation to the Jewish nation undoubtedly represents the consciousness of the Church at the close of the first century rather than the historic Jesus of the Gospels. Again, it is not only the identity of the opposition that has suffered a change; the controversy itself has also undergone a complete transformation. It turns no longer upon Christ's attitude towards the Law or upon His Messianic claims. The objections that he answers in this Gospel are concerned with His unity with God, His pre-existence, the partaking of His flesh and blood, and the apparent failure of His mission. We have here to do not with the conflict between Jesus and His enemies, but with the hostility of Judaism to Apostolic Christianity. The points raised and answered in the Gospel are precisely those which were urged by the Jews against the rival religion, and they meet us continually in the controversial literature of the second century. It seems, therefore, that the Evangelist has read back into his record of the past his own experience of the controversies and conflicts of his own age.

(*b*) *The Attitude of the Gospel towards the Baptist.*—

The account of St. John the Baptist and of his mission as given in the Fourth Gospel is strongly at variance with the corresponding record in the Synoptic Gospels. There he is the champion of a religious reformation, the preacher of repentance and of good works. In St. John his office is merely to be a witness to the light, and once he has pointed out Jesus as the Christ he disappears. There is no mention of the Baptism of Christ or of the Baptist's embassy from prison, and there is apparently a deliberate intention to subordinate the Baptist to Christ. Now in Acts xviii. and xix. we find evidence of the existence of a Baptist party at Ephesus long after the death of the Baptist himself, and it is quite possible that the explanation of the attitude of St. John towards the latter lies in the fact that at Ephesus, some forty or fifty years later, there was a residue of the Baptist party which took up a position of sharp antagonism to the Church. There is further evidence in the *Clementine Recognitions* which shows that a Baptist sect existed as late as the beginning of the third century.

(c) *The Third Polemical Element in the Gospel is directed against Certain Phases of Gnosticism.*—In this respect the Gospel is in line with Colossians, the Apocalypse, and 1 St. John. The peculiar form of Gnosticism which the Epistle and Gospel seem to have in view is Docetism. There is no express mention of the heresy in either document, but the repeated emphasis upon the reality of Christ's humanity proves that the Evangelist had it constantly in his mind. The dominant Gnostic ideas are frequently touched upon, and some of the most characteristic and most technical of Gnostic terms are constantly in evidence, such as "life," "light,"

"knowledge," and "love." It is to be noticed, however, that he avoids the use of substantives such as γνῶσις, πίστις, σοφία, and is careful to use only the verbal forms γιγνώσκειν, πιστεύειν, while ἀλήθεια always takes the place of σοφία, which seems to denote that the Evangelist was anxious to guard himself from any possible confusion of his teaching with that of the heretical systems.[1] On the other hand, his apparent sympathy with Gnostic ideas has led some to conclude that the Gospel proceeded from a Gnostic source, and as early as the latter half of the second century it was fiercely attacked and rejected by certain bodies of Christians on this ground.[2] A close study of the Gospel, however, brings the conviction that the Evangelist's sympathy and identity with the Gnostic movement are confined to the adoption of ideas common to the culture of his age, which he considered to be of value for a wider interpretation of the Christian creed.

2. *Three Incidents of Doubtful Historicity.*—There are also three incidents recorded in the Gospel in connection with which very serious objections to its historical accuracy have been raised by critics who are by no means extreme in their methods.

These are :

(*a*) *The Cleansing of the Temple.*—In this case St. John seems to have misplaced the incident which, according to him, occurred at the beginning of the Ministry. The sequence of events in the Synoptic narrative is certainly more natural and more true to life. There it is placed at the close of the Ministry, where it forms one of the main causes of the hostility of the Jewish hierarchy against Jesus, and leads

[1] Scott, *op. cit.* pp. 93, 94. [2] See p. 384.

indirectly to His arrest, trial, and death. The normal explanation that there were two such cleansings, one at the beginning and one at the end of the Ministry, hardly commends itself. It is not impossible, however, that the misplacing may be due to the Synoptists and not to St. John. If the incident did take place in Jerusalem early in the Ministry, the other Evangelists, who have kept only one visit to Jerusalem on record, would have no option but to connect the incident with that one visit.

(*b*) *The Institution of the Eucharist.*—St. John, though apparently giving a detailed account of the Last Supper, altogether ignores the institution of the Eucharist, and connects the Eucharistic teaching with an early Galilean miracle, the feeding of the five thousand. Mr. C. H. Dodd,[1] in the *Expositor* for December 1911, in a paper on "Eucharistic Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel" has, however, pointed out that even in St. Mark there is a distinct suggestion of a parallel between the Last Supper and the feeding of the five thousand with bread and fish, and that in the account of the feeding of the four thousand it is more than a suggestion. Here the account is condensed, formal, and highly liturgical in character, presenting a marked development of the previous account, which is a simple, vivid narrative, in which the liturgical element is slight. In both accounts, however, the Eucharistic liturgical terms εὐχαριστήσας, ἔκλασεν, εὐλογήσας are employed. Hence it is by no means impossible that, while the Last Supper was normally the central embodiment of Eucharistic ideas, it was not the only embodiment, and that the association of Eucharistic teaching

[1] *Expositor*, viii. 2. p. 530 f.

with the miracle of feeding was not initiated by St. John.[1]

(*c*) Last, and most difficult of all, comes the *Story of the raising of Lazarus*. I will quote the words of Mr. Burkitt, an extremely sane and fair-minded critic, on this point: "The discrepancy between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic narrative comes to a head in the story of Lazarus. It is not a question of the impossibility or improbability of the miracle, but of the time, and place, and effect upon outsiders. There is no room for the miracle in St. Mark. If the event was so public as St. John insists, so fraught with influences upon friends and foes, they could not have been unknown to a well-informed personage like St. Mark, and there is no reason for suppressing a narrative so public and so edifying. St. Mark is silent about the raising of Lazarus because he did not know of it, and, therefore, because it never occurred."[2] Mr. Scott also uses language much to the same effect in his criticism of the story.[3] The view of these scholars and of those who see with them is that the story is a dramatised version of the Lucan Parable of "The Rich Man and Lazarus," helped out by certain borrowings from the tenth chapter of St. Luke's Gospel, where Mary and Martha are introduced into the narrative. It is open to argument, however, whether Professor Burkitt is not laying too much stress upon the silence of St. Mark and the impossibility of his ignoring the incident if he knew of it. He had already placed on record one such raising of the dead by Jesus, and he may have considered that this was quite sufficient for his purpose.

[1] See also "The Eucharist before the Passion" in A. Wright's *New Testament Problems*.

[2] Burkitt, *op. cit.* p. 221 f.

[3] Scott, *op. cit.* p. 37 f.

Summary.—The discussion was opened with the suggestion that the true solution of the problem of the historicity of St. John's Gospel lay midway between the two extreme views, one of which accepted it as strict history, while the other looked upon it as a theological treatise, pure and simple, and, therefore, possessing no historical value. It has been pointed out that the Gospel was written at a very critical period of the Church's history and to meet very special conditions and requirements on the part of that Church, and that this explains the presence in it of much that was at first sight difficult to account for. The motive of the Evangelist was assuredly not the writing of a history, but the interpreting of the life and teaching of Christ in such a way as to impress the mind of his own age. To use St. John's own words, he wrote his Gospel in order "that they might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing they might have life." Working in this spirit and with this motive he utilised all the material at his disposal with the greatest freedom. The facts that he records are, generally speaking, actual historic facts, although in many cases he has taken considerable liberties with his authorities and modified them substantially to suit his own purposes. Even where the incidents are unknown to the Synoptists they are not altogether without parallels in the other Gospels, and in some cases the Johannine record is only an expansion of what was perhaps little more than a suggestion in the other three. The discourses are frankly Johannine in style and phraseology, but here also the substance is largely implicit in the Synoptists, and all that St. John has done has been to interpret them to meet the requirements of a

new age and of a new culture. He reads the life and teaching of Christ in the light of a long Christian experience, and it is the idea based upon the fact, and not the simple fact, that is of supreme importance in his mind. In some instances we found reason to believe that the evidence of St. John is actually superior to that of the Synoptic Gospels, while in others we had to doubt the accuracy of the record. The historicity of the story of the raising of Lazarus must be left an open question. On the whole I am inclined to think that the Fourth Gospel contains more strict history than it is sometimes credited with, and that its contents are by no means to be despised in the formation of an accurate and complete conception of the life, work, and character of Jesus Christ. It is not necessary to enlarge upon the spiritual value of the Gospel, in virtue of which it stands unique and unapproachable, and the chapter may fitly close with two quotations from two scholars belonging to very different schools of critical thought, Schmiedel and Swete :

" Of supreme value not only for that age but for all time is the full assurance of its faith in the truth of Christianity. The idea of God is apprehended with a depth that is nowhere else approached in the New Testament." [1]

" The Gospel according to St. John, while it has always had a singular attraction for the cultivated intellect, is also, above all other books in the New Testament, the chosen guide of the unlearned, the poor and the suffering members of the Church. It is surely a remarkable tribute to the genius or the inspiration of a religious writer to say that he can

[1] Schmiedel, *Ency. Bibl.* vol. ii. col. 2558.

command the attention at once of the philosopher and the peasant, the intellectually strong and the intellectually feeble. This is not true of St. Paul, but it is true of St. John." [1]

It is also worthy of notice that the Gospel took captive the imagination of the greatest of modern English poets. We still look to Browning's "Death in the Desert" for the best spiritual exposition of the teaching of St. John.

[1] Swete, *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 556.

CHAPTER X

THE JOHANNINE LITERATURE (*contd.*)

THE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN

The First Epistle of St. John

Form and Character of the Writing.—This writing has been known as the "Epistle" of John from the time of Irenaeus, who is the first patristic author to refer to it definitely by name. The document itself, however, bears none of the usual marks of an Epistle. It contains neither address nor subscription, and there is in it not a single definite allusion, personal, historical, or geographical. It gives no direct clue to the author, and there is no special destination indicated. This complete absence of all data of this character has led many writers to regard the title of "Epistle" as a misnomer, and to look upon the writing as a manifesto, or homily,[1] addressed, not to any particular circle of Churches or believers, but to Christendom at large. But although the writing may be lacking in the elements which we generally associate with a letter, a study of its contents reveals within it so many of the essential features of a personal document that to describe it as an encyclical, or a manifesto, is not quite adequate. The

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 583.

author is not dealing with abstractions, but with life and living men, and the whole Epistle is instinct with intense personal feeling. Those whom the author addresses are known to him, and he has an intimate acquaintance with their position and history. He speaks in a voice of unimpeachable authority, as one who by his previous work among them, and by his present acknowledged position in the Church, has the right to exercise the fatherly prerogatives of counsel and warning. Westcott's [1] description of the Epistle as a Pastoral addressed to those who had been carefully trained and had long lived in the Faith perhaps best suits the contents and spirit of the writing as a whole.

The Relationship of the Epistle to the Fourth Gospel.—The prevailing view among modern scholars is that the Epistle and Fourth Gospel are both the work of one and the same author, but there is a by no means inconsiderable body of authority and an increasing one which takes the opposite view. The close relationship of the two documents is so obvious that, if they did not come from the same hand, the less important of the two must have proceeded from one who consciously imitated the vocabulary and style of the Gospel, unless we are to accept the view of Moffatt [2] and others that the Epistle came from a writer belonging to the general Johannine school of thought and feeling, thoroughly steeped in his master's spirit and style, who, therefore, naturally and unconsciously walked in the master's footsteps. Bacon's theory, that all three Epistles formed an editorial framework composed by the author of St. John chaps. i.-xx. as a commendatory document in

[1] Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John*, p. xxix.
[2] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 591.

order to ensure the acceptance of the Gospel, has already been noticed.[1]

The case for the common authorship of the two writings is exceedingly strong. The links of connection are so numerous in language, style, and thought, even more so perhaps than in the case of the Third Gospel and Acts, that at first sight it might seem to savour somewhat of hypercriticism to dispute this hypothesis. The list of phrases common to the two writings is most striking, and fills more than three whole pages of the latest English Commentary on the Epistles.[2] On the other hand, it is maintained that the differences between the two documents, while not so numerous as the coincidences, are not less vital, and point to a definite divergence of standpoint and outlook. These differences extend both to language and ideas. An appreciable number of significant words and phrases are found in the Epistle which are not used in the Gospel, such as *ἀγγελία*, *ἀνομία*, *ἐλπίς*, *ἐπαγγελία*, *ἱλασμός*, *κοινωνία*, *ὁμολογεῖν τὸν Θεόν*, *παλαιός*, *παρουσία*, *χρῖσμα*, *ψευδοπροφῆται*, while several characteristic expressions in the Gospel are omitted in the Epistle. Some minor points of differences of grammatical style are also cited as evidence pointing in the same direction.

In the realm of *ideas* it is pointed out that *the use of the Old Testament* in either document marks a serious divergence between the writings. In the Epistle the Old Testament is never cited. The most salient difference between the Epistle and Gospel lies in the conception of *the function of Christ in the scheme of relationship between God and the Christian believer*. In the Gospel the relation of Christ to God

[1] See p. 381.

[2] Brooke, *The Johannine Epistles*, pp. ii-iv.

on the one hand and to the believer on the other is emphasised, but in the Epistle the relationship between the Father and the believer is more direct, and there is no specific mention of Christ as the essential medium between the Father and the believing Christian. It is maintained further that the doctrine of the Logos in the Epistle is different from that found in the Gospel. In the Epistle it is the " word of Eternal life " that is identified with the person of Christ and not the " Logos " as such. Considerable importance is also attached to the difference between the *eschatological* standpoints of the two writings. In the Epistle the " parousia " is still looked for in the near future, whereas in the Gospel all expectation in that particular direction has been apparently abandoned. A difficulty is also felt in harmonising the *comparatively commonplace conceptions of the Epistle* with the *lofty and sublime ideals* which are so characteristic *of the Gospel.* The remarkable and general affinities in language, style, and thought between the two writings have, therefore, to be weighed against some striking divergences in points of detail, which may be due to external conditions governing the documents, such as differences of aim and purpose on the part of the author. The points of divergence are undeniable, but it is questionable whether they are fundamental, and whether they extend beyond the matter of expression. If we can imagine the Epistle to have been written as a sequel to the Gospel, and written because those to whom the Gospel had been addressed had failed to apprehend its spirit and meaning, much of what is peculiar to the former writing would be explained. The descent from the high level of the Gospel would then be due

not to the lower achievements of the author but to an accommodation to the less spiritual and less intelligent capacity of the readers. I am inclined to think that, on the whole, the differences are not more serious than we might naturally look for in writings proceeding from the same author, one historical and the other didactic, one written to elucidate the profound teaching of the other and to adapt it to the purposes of spiritual and religious life.[1]

The Priority of the Gospel.—In the preceding paragraph we have assumed that the Gospel was written before the Epistle. It is necessary to bear in mind, however, that this hypothesis is not accepted by all scholars. Lightfoot[2] held the view that the Epistle was written at the same time as the Gospel as a kind of covering letter to it, and Holtzmann urges that, if the common authorship is to be accepted, it can only be on the assumption that the Epistle represents an earlier phase of the author's theological position. It is argued that the introduction in 1 St. John i. 1-4 is preliminary to the more clearly defined Logos doctrine in the prologue of the Gospel, that the eschatological outlook in the Epistle points to a period earlier than that of the Gospel, and that there are traces in the former of a nearer approach to the Pauline teaching, more especially on the subject of "propitiation," than is compatible with a date later than the Gospel. The dependence of the Epistle as a whole upon the Gospel is, however, so clearly manifested that it outweighs all the considerations which seem to point in the other direction. It is not too much to say that apart from the Gospel

[1] Brooke, *op. cit.* p. xix.
[2] Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, pp. 61, 99, 198.

the Epistle is hardly intelligible, and that "from first to last, it presupposes on the part of its readers a close acquaintance with the Gospel or with a compact body of teaching like that which is found in the Gospel." [1]

Date and Destination. — The acknowledged differences between the Gospel and the Epistle render it probable that a space of some years intervened between the composition of the two writings. The external evidence, which shows that the Epistle was valued and known by Polycarp and Papias, does not allow of a date much later than A.D. 110, and we shall not be far wrong if we place the writing of the Epistle somewhere in the first decade of the second century. Schmiedel,[2] who dates the Epistle as late as A.D. 140, has no following among rational critics. There is no direct indication in the Epistle of its intended destination. Tradition has always associated the Johannine Epistles with Asia Minor, and especially with Ephesus, and there is nothing in the Epistles themselves which in any way leads us to think that tradition has erred in this matter. The position assumed by the author in relation to the Churches addressed, the false teaching combated in them, and the conditions of Church life and organisation outlined in them, are quite compatible with the position of affairs known to have existed in the province of Asia Minor towards the close of the first century.

The Heresies combated in the Epistle.—The opponents whom the author has in view in the Epistle are regarded by most scholars as being associated

[1] Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 245.
[2] Schmiedel, *Ency. Bibl.* vol. ii. col. 2557.

with some form or forms of Gnosticism, and more especially perhaps with Docetism and the heresy of Cerinthus. Recently, however, a new theory has been put forward by Wurm and Clemen,[1] both of whom affirm that only one form of false teaching is combated in the Epistle, though they differ as to the precise nature of that teaching. Wurm is of opinion that the opponents are entirely Judaic, and bases his theory on 1 St. John ii. 23, which, according to him, can only mean that the false teachers themselves are not conscious of holding any views of God different from those held by Apostolic Christians generally, and that the only divergence between their teaching and that of the Church consisted in the fact that they denied the Son as the Revealer of the Father. The verse, then, clearly points to the Jews, of whom alone it could be said that their conception of God was not materially different from that of Christians. The fatal objection to this theory is the fact that the opponents are definitely described as having at one time been members of the Christian Church. Cf. ii. 19, "They went out from us, but they were not of us," a description which cannot possibly apply to Jews, pure and simple. That the writer had in view the Judaic controversy is more than probable, both from the incidental references in the Epistle itself and from the strong evidence which the Gospel supplies of the prominent position assumed by this question in the life of the Church at this period. But the contention that the Jews were the one and only section of opponents contemplated in the Epistle does not bear inspection.

The Epistle points most clearly to the fact that

[1] Brooke, *op. cit.* p. 76.

much of the false teaching attacked was Gnostic in character, and it is possible that more than one form of Gnostic teaching was in the writer's mind. There are traces of tenets of a Docetic character, and chap. v. 6 seems to point definitely to the heresy of Cerinthus, who, while acknowledging that the Baptism of Jesus was a real mark of His Messianic career, refused to admit that the Passion was an essential part of the Messianic work of salvation.

The Second and Third Epistles of St. John

Authorship.—The Second and Third Epistles of St. John are differentiated from the First by the fact that, whereas the latter has none of the features which we usually associate with a letter and is absolutely devoid of any personal or historical data, the other two contain specific reference to the writer as the "elder," and are in each case addressed to a definite destination, the Second to "the elect lady," and the Third to "Gaius the beloved." This marked divergence has been taken by many critics to imply that a different writer from that of the First Epistle is involved in the case of the other two. It is also urged that there are several other features which point to the same conclusion, such as the character of the false teaching in the second letter, which is alleged to imply a later phase of Gnosticism than that contemplated in the First Epistle. Certain linguistic differences, as *e.g.* the collocation of χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη, which is said not to be Johannine, are adduced in support of this contention. The history of the New Testament is also said to favour this view. The Second and Third Epistles found their way into

the Canon much later than, and independently of, the First, which seems to argue a separate origin for the former group, but, on the other hand, there is considerable evidence that the First and Second were accepted as canonical before the group of three was generally recognised. The history of the Canon can, therefore, hardly be said to be decisive on this point. If this disjunctive theory is accepted, the group of Johannine writings becomes split into two sections, consisting of the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle on the one side, and the Second and Third Epistles and the Apocalypse on the other. In this case there is much to be said in favour of the view advocated by Moffatt[1] and others that the second group is to be definitely associated with "John the Presbyter."

I am not, however, convinced that the reasons advanced justify us in abandoning the traditional theory that the three Epistles form a homogeneous group which proceeded from the hand of one and the same author, and this conclusion is accepted by the great majority of scholars.

The Destination of the Second Epistle.—The modern tendency is to find in "the elect lady" of i. 1 a mere synonym for some particular Christian community to which the letter is addressed. There are authorities, such as Harnack and Salmond, who still plead that the expression should be interpreted in its simplicity, and that the Epistle is to be regarded as a private letter written to a Christian lady of standing in the Church. Dr. Rendel Harris[2] is a strenuous supporter of this theory, and maintains

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 481.
[2] Rendel Harris, *Expositor*, vi. 3. p. 194 f

that the evidence of recently discovered papyri points conclusively in this direction. The epithet *κύριος* is, according to him, invariably used as a term of endearment in these documents, and the phrase in the Epistle *ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ* can, therefore, only mean "to the dear lady" whose name was Electa. He also points out that *v.* 8 in the letter confirms this view. The words, "Look to yourselves, that ye lose not the things which we have wrought," are a direct quotation from the blessing of Ruth by Boaz in Ruth ii. 12. Cf. *βλέπετε ἑαυτοὺς ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσητε ἃ εἰργασάμεθα, ἀλλὰ μισθὸν πλήρη ἀπολάβητε* (2 St. John *v.* 8) with *ἀποτίσαι κύριος τὴν ἐργασίαν σου· γένοιτο ὁ μισθός σου πλήρης παρὰ κυρίου Θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ* (Ruth ii. 12). This quotation leads Rendel Harris to conclude that the lady addressed in the letter was, like Ruth, a Gentile proselyte, and in all probability a widow, as, although children are mentioned, there is no allusion to a husband, unless we are to identify him with the Gaius of the Third Epistle. The fact that the third letter is undoubtedly addressed to an individual is in favour of some such interpretation as this. But there are serious difficulties connected with this view. If Electa is the name of an individual we have two sisters of the same name mentioned in the course of the letter (*vv.* 1, 13),[1] and the twofold allusion to the "children," and more especially the second allusion in *v.* 13, is not easy to explain on this theory. The doctrinal contents of the Epistle are certainly much more compatible with a communication meant for a Christian community than for an individual Christian, and it is on this

[1] It should, however, be noted that in the papyrus letter quoted on page 180 the name Ptolemaios appears *twice* among the children greeted by their mother, Serapias.

ground mainly that the purely personal character of the Epistle is rejected by most scholars.

The Epistle was, then, probably addressed to one of the general circle of Churches which is contemplated in the First Epistle. Its primary object was to warn this particular Church against extending indiscriminate hospitality to wandering Christian teachers, whose soundness in the faith might not be above suspicion, and who were, therefore, to be tested both as to their manner of life and as to their freedom from the taint of the Docetic heresy. The situation, in some respects, reminds us of that in the *Didachē*, where the manner of the reception of itinerant prophets is treated with much detail.

The Relation of the Second Epistle to the Third.—There is a considerable body of opinion in favour of the idea that the two letters were written at the same time and had the same Church in view, the Second being addressed to the community as a whole, and the Third to a prominent individual in that community, and that the Second Epistle is actually referred to in *v.* 9 of the Third. The two letters are almost exactly of the same length, and each one would just cover one page of papyrus of ordinary size. The Third Epistle would in that case have been sent to Gaius to obviate the risk of the more public letter being suppressed by Diotrephes. Harnack,[1] however, strenuously opposes the identification of the Second Epistle with the letter alluded to in the Third, and urges that the two Epistles could not possibly have been intended for the same destination. The situation implied in the Third Epistle is, according to him, quite different from that implied

[1] Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, xv. 3.

in the Second. There is, *e.g.*, no hint in the Third of the existence of false teachers in the community, and, again, the Second is devoid of any reference to Diotrephes. As against the identification of the Second Epistle with the letter alluded to in 3 *v.* 9 he points out that the Second Epistle contains little or nothing which corresponds to what we might naturally expect in a "suppressed" letter. It is possible, however, that both Epistles were meant for the same destination, but that the letter of 3 *v.* 9 belongs to that vast body of early Christian correspondence which has been irretrievably lost.

THE HISTORICAL SITUATION IMPLIED IN THE EPISTLES.—The reconstruction of the historical situation implied in the two Epistles, and more especially the identification of the individuals mentioned in the Third, have been attempted by several scholars during recent years. The most elaborate attempt is perhaps that of Dom Chapman which appeared in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for 1904, in which he identifies the Demetrius of the Third Epistle with Demas of 2 Tim. iv. 10, and Gaius with St. Paul's host at Corinth mentioned in Romans xvi. 23, who afterwards, according to Origen, became bishop of Thessalonica. The main motive of the Third Epistle was to ensure for Demas, who had been under a cloud because of his desertion of St. Paul, a favourable reception from the Thessalonian Church and its bishop. Vernon Bartlet embarked upon a similar enterprise in the same journal for 1905, and arrived at the conclusion that Demetrius is the silversmith of that name who led the riot at Ephesus, and that the Church to which the letter was sent was the Church of Thyatira.

Both attempts belong to the realm of pure conjecture, and the conclusions are based upon reasons which carry with them no conviction. A very valuable contribution to the study of the Third Epistle is that of Harnack,[1] who emphasises its extreme importance as throwing considerable light upon a certain stage in the history of the Church in Asia Minor. He points out the significance of the position of the Elder, whom he identifies with "John the Elder" mentioned by Papias, in reference to the Churches of the province, and shows how in his dealings with individuals and with Churches he is following closely in the footsteps of his great predecessor St. Paul. In the opposition of Diotrephes he sees the beginning of the movement which culminated in the firm establishment of the monarchical Episcopate. The action of Diotrephes is a revolt against the primitive provincial organisation, with the Elder at its head, in the interests of the local Churches. The Epistle, therefore, according to Harnack, is an extremely valuable contribution to the history of the Church during a period of much obscurity, and takes us to the very source of a movement which was destined to play an all-important part in the later development of the Church. The suggestion is full of interest, but is open to some very weighty objections. The most serious is perhaps the fact that John of Asia is represented by a perfect chain of patristic writers as having been closely associated with the establishment of Episcopacy, in the Ignatian sense, in that province. It is, therefore, difficult to believe, in the face of this universal tradition, that the movement was

[1] Harnack, *op. cit.*

originated against his will and directed against him personally.

Again, the trouble with regard to Diotrephes need not necessarily have reference to ecclesiastical polity at all. There is nothing to show that Diotrephes was a bishop, and the contents of the two Epistles on the whole lead us to look for the bone of contention in the direction of doctrinal rather than of purely ecclesiastical questions. And even if the point at issue was confined to questions of Church organisation, Harnack's explanation is not necessarily and exclusively correct. It is quite possible that Diotrephes was on the defence, and that he was fighting for the old independence of the local Church against the encroachments of the central authority represented by the Elder. Without, however, accepting Harnack's hypothesis in all its details we can appreciate his emphasis upon the value of the Epistles as marking a notable stage in the growth of the Church and in the history of its organisation. It is a period of transition, when the old system is beginning to break down. The Elder feels that his authority is diminishing and that it is no longer effective at a distance. His letter may be refused a hearing, and it is only when he comes in person that all is well. The Apostolic Church is giving way to the sub-Apostolic, and the more elaborate constitution of the Ignatian age is at the door.

CHAPTER XI

THE JOHANNINE LITERATURE (*contd.*)

THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN

ALTHOUGH the Apocalypse still remains in some respects the most obscure of all the books of the New Testament, the last thirty years have witnessed such a substantial advance both in methods and principles of interpretation that, while there is much that has yet to be elucidated, the book has certainly emerged out of the gloom and darkness which surrounded it in the past. Three main factors have contributed to this result.

(1) The acquisition of fresh historical knowledge with reference to the Roman provincial administration in the latter half of the first century and to the attitude of the Empire towards the Church during the same period, in the shape of Inscriptions, etc.

(2) The renewed study of Jewish non-canonical apocalyptic literature.

(3) The labours of students of *Comparative Religions*, and more particularly the researches into the history and character of the ancient religions of Babylonia and Assyria.

With the help of the first factor we are now enabled to reproduce with tolerable accuracy the

historical background of the book, and to estimate the influence of contemporary history upon its scope and character. The renewed interest taken in the apocalyptic literature of later Judaism has made it possible to set the Apocalypse of St. John in its right place as one of a long series of books of a similar tendency. It stands no longer in splendid isolation, but is now found to be the noblest example of a type of writing which had been much in vogue since the prophecy of Daniel was produced in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes.

The excavations among the ruins of the great cities of Assyria and Babylon and the knowledge gained thereby of the mythologies and cosmologies connected with the religions of these ancient Empires seem destined to exercise considerable influence upon the future interpretation of much of the symbolic and figurative language of the Apocalypse, which had hitherto been the despair of the student.

The Unity of the Book.—The attention of recent criticism has been mainly concentrated upon the structure of the book. Prior to 1880 the literary unity of the Apocalypse had been generally taken for granted, but from that year onwards a long array of scholars, principally in Germany, has been exercising its ingenuity in analysing the book into what are claimed to be its original elements and sources.

The hypothesis that the Apocalypse, in its present form, is a compilation by an editor of sources derived from various quarters is supported by the following data:

(1) There are awkward transitions at several points, which interrupt the thread of the movement.

(2) Some sections are practically devoid of any distinctively Christian doctrine.

(3) The Christology of some of the sections stands on a different level from that found in others.

(4) The same idea is viewed under different aspects in different parts of the book.

(5) The historical conditions implied are not identical throughout the book, and different dates are postulated, *e.g.* in chaps. xi., xiii., and xvii.

The following are some of the most important analytical schemes which have been published during the last thirty years.

Völter,[1] who was the first to attempt a source-analysis of the Apocalypse, sees in the book evidence of three Apocalypses :. (*a*) An original Apocalypse of John published in A.D. 65. (*b*) This was formed by adding to (*a*) an Apocalypse of Cerinthus about 70 A.D. (*c*) The book in its present form, which is the work of a redactor in the time of Trajan.

Vischer,[2] whose theory was adopted by Harnack and Martineau, postulates a Jewish original document worked over afterwards by a Christian editor.

Spitta[3] analysed the book according to the subject matter of the different sections. This gives him three sources : a Seal source, which is Christian and dates from about the year A.D. 60 ; a Trumpet source, and a Vial source, both of which are Jewish. The book owes its present form to the hand of a Jewish redactor.

Erbes[4] differs from his predecessors in ascribing

[1] Völter, *Die Entstehung der Apoc.*, 1882–1885 ; *Die Offenbarung Johannis neu untersucht und erläutert*, 1904.

[2] Vischer, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, ii. 3, 1886. Second edition, 1895.

[3] Spitta, *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, 1884.

[4] Erbes, *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, 1891.

to the book an exclusively Christian origin. It is composed of three Christian sources belonging respectively to the reigns of Caligula, Nero, and Domitian.

These scholars have rendered undoubted service in emphasising the idiosyncrasies and peculiarities which characterise the various sections; but the source-analysis is in no case very convincing, and every theory is vitiated by the fact that attention is exclusively concentrated on the features that make for a lack of unity, while the very powerful impression which the book gives of being the conception of one mind, written by one hand, is practically never considered by them.

An entirely new factor was introduced into the criticism of the Apocalypse by the publication of Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos* in 1894. Gunkel condemns root and branch the principle which interpreted the symbolical language along the lines of contemporary historical events, and is equally severe upon the method which claims to explain the book by means of literary analysis. The phenomena which lay at the root of the many source-analyses are not due to a stratification of documents, but are to be explained by the influence of ancient Babylonian myths and traditions, which the Apocalyptist has incorporated in his prophecy. Contemporary history is utterly inadequate to satisfy the intensely figurative language of the book, and the origin of its symbols and figures is to be looked for in a long line of apocalyptic and mythical tradition which the writer has inherited. Thus chap. xii. looks back to the old Babylonian myth of Marduk, the conqueror of the Dragon, while traces of similar influences are found in other parts of the book, notably in chaps. xiii. and

xvii. It is to the influence of Babylonian mythology that we also owe the symbolism associated with the number 7, the angels, the stars, the candlesticks, and the eyes, as well as the twenty-four elders and the numbers $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 666. Gunkel, following the tendency so characteristic of German scholars to ascribe everything possible and impossible to one single source, has probably exaggerated the influence of Babylonian traditions upon the writer of the Apocalypse, and has failed to do justice to the manifest references to contemporary historical events with which the book is studded. He has, nevertheless, suggested a line of enquiry which is bound to have a considerable effect upon the future interpretation of the Apocalypse as a whole.[1]

Bousset [2] has also made a valuable contribution to the study of the book by his researches into the Antichrist legend. He claims that the Apocalypse is dependent upon this in a series of passages, particularly in chap. xi.

A word must be said here with reference to Bacon's theory to which we have alluded in a previous chapter.[3] According to his view the main portion of the book (chaps. iv.-xxi.) is a Palestinian prophecy, and this has been enclosed in a prologue (chaps. i.-iii.) and an epilogue (chap. xxii.), both added later. While the opening chapters are devoted to St. John's vision in Patmos and to the conditions and dangers of the Seven Churches of Asia, the main body of the work is absolutely devoid of any consideration for the his-

[1] For a very excellent review of Gunkel's theory see Mr. Porter's article in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. iv. p. 256 f.

[2] See Bousset, *Antichrist*, E.T., 1896, and articles "Antichrist" in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* and *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*.

[3] See Book II. Chap. VIII.

torical conditions of Ephesus and its sister Churches. The author does not betray by one syllable a knowledge of proconsular Asia and its problems, and is to all appearances entirely unconscious of the existence of such places as Ephesus, Smyrna, and Thyatira. In chaps. iv.-xxi. the scene is Palestine, and the subject is the outcome of Jerusalem's agonising struggle against Rome. The author confines himself exclusively to the interests of Jewish and Jewish-Christian Apocalyptic. Its attraction for the Christians of Asia Minor lay in its subject matter, which appealed to them because they also were facing a most determined attack from pagans and heretics. The prologue and epilogue were added because a mere anonymous prophecy from Palestine could not possibly obtain any authoritative currency in Asia, and some name of Apostolic weight must, therefore, be attached to it. The Apocalypse in its present form was then brought forth in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, near the end of the reign of Domitian, but it was only the enclosing letters to the Churches and the epilogue that owed their origin to that place and period. The main prophecy is occupied exclusively with the rivalry of Jerusalem and Rome, and bears unmistakable marks of its Palestinian provenance, not only in the historical and geographical situation presupposed, but also in the Hebraisms of its language and in its avowed translations from Hebrew.[1]

The force of Bacon's argument is diminished by two considerations :

(*a*) The prologue and epilogue make no claim whatsoever to Apostolic authority. If these sections

[1] Bacon, *The Making of the New Testament*, pp. 188-205.

were added for the specific purpose of obtaining currency for the Apocalypse on the score of Apostolic authorship we might surely expect that the attestation would be definite and free from any ambiguity. The inclusion of the simple name John is not adequate for the purpose claimed for it by Bacon.

(*b*) The linguistic argument is completely vitiated by the fact that the Hebraisms and the uncouth Greek are quite as prominent in the letters to the Seven Churches, if not more so, as in any other section of the book.

Partly as the result of Gunkel's theories, and partly in consequence of improved methods of literary criticism, the phenomena to which the school of source-analysts owes its origin are now accounted for along other and less drastic lines. The present tendency is in the direction of recognising in the Apocalypse a substantial literary unity, in which several earlier fragments, not from the author's pen, have been interpolated, notably vii. 1-8, xii. 1-10, xiii. and xvii., which are assigned to the reigns of Nero, Vespasian, and Domitian respectively. This hypothesis was first suggested by Weizsäcker,[1] was subsequently adopted by Sabatier, Jülicher, Bousset, F. C. Porter, and M'Giffert, and is in favour with many of our most recent authorities such as Peake [2] and Moffatt.[3] The theory commends itself strongly to the present writer, and is the only hypothesis that seems to do justice to the data as a whole. It recognises the linguistic unity of the whole book, and gives an adequate explanation of the many features that point in the contrary direction. There are manifold signs

[1] Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, vol. ii. p. 175 f.
[2] Peake, *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 160-161.
[3] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 490

of the influence upon the Apocalyptist of traditions of various origins, some of which are incongruous and inconsistent with one another: the book is not altogether homogeneous in character, and the vision is occasionally interrupted by the interpolation of fragments and sections which are not essential to the vision at all. Many of its conceptions reach back to the earlier prophets, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, but we also recognise the effect upon the writer of the apocalyptic literature of later Judaism, of the Books of Enoch and the Psalms of Solomon. Other and more extraneous elements have also played their part in the composition of the book, such as Babylonian, Persian, Egyptian, and Greek mythologies and cosmologies, partly, but not exclusively, through the indirect medium of later Judaistic literature.

It appears to me that these phenomena are only capable of one explanation. To use the words of Moffatt,[1] "the author was an editor no less than a transcriber of personal visions." He inherited old traditions, which had passed through various phases before they reached him and were worked over and readapted by the author for his own purpose. But whatever be the extent and character of the traditions and fragments which the author has interpolated in his work, he is no mere compiler. The whole of the Apocalypse is written in a language of its own, and the author has impressed his specific and peculiar style upon every line of the book.

Dr. Swete, whose edition of the Apocalypse, published in 1906, is far superior to anything of the kind that has appeared before, adopts a more conservative attitude with reference to the interpolation

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 492.

of sources. While allowing that the author makes free use of any materials to which he had access and which were available for his purpose, he is more than doubtful whether he transferred large masses of earlier apocalyptic writing to his own work in such a manner as to detract from its substantial unity. In support of his attitude on this question he adduces the author's method of dealing with the Old Testament. There are in the Apocalypse forty-five references to the Book of Daniel, and the prophecies of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah are used almost as frequently. The whole book is steeped in the thought and imagery of the Hebrew Scriptures to an extent that is not found elsewhere in the New Testament, and yet the Old Testament is never actually quoted, and its *ipsissima verba* are rarely used. Swete is, therefore, of opinion that, if the writer is indebted to non-canonical apocalyptic literature at all, a hypothesis which is by no means proved, he must have acted on the principle which he adopted in the case of the Old Testament, and could not have interpolated fragments in the manner claimed by the "incorporation" theory. The influence of later Jewish Apocalyptic was, therefore, confined to minor points of imagery and diction. He recognises the existence of a serious difficulty, however, if it can be proved that xi. 1 implies that the Temple at Jerusalem was still standing and that xvii. 10 points to the fact that the reign of Vespasian had not yet come to an end, while the general tenor of the book indicates a date in the reign of Domitian. He is doubtful, however, whether in these contexts the inferences are certain. He also suggests that the difficulty raised by the apparent difference of dates may be got over if the Apocalyptist

issued two editions of his work, one in the late sixties, and a later one towards the end of the reign of Domitian, a hypothesis also advocated by Barth.[1] The force of Swete's argument from the author's use of the Old Testament is undeniable, and yet I am not convinced that his position here adequately disposes of all the points at issue. I remain, therefore, still of opinion that the phenomena demand a more substantial and definite influence on the part of apocalyptic and mythical traditions than Swete is prepared to concede.[2]

The Date of the Apocalypse.—The Apocalypse was almost universally assigned by early Christian tradition to the last years of Domitian. The only exceptions to this view are contained in the titles prefixed to the Syriac versions of the book, where the banishment of St. John is placed in the reign of Nero, and in Epiphanius (*Haer.* ii. 12), who assigns both the exile and the return to the reign of Nero. Nineteenth-century criticism was, however, practically unanimous in regarding the book as a work of the reign of Nero, or of the years immediately following his death. This was the position adopted by the Tübingen school as well as by the three great Cambridge scholars, Lightfoot, Westcott, and Hort. The Tübingen theory, which saw in the Balaamites and Nicolaitans Pauline Christians whose views were distasteful to the narrower Christianity of St. John, required a date not far removed from the death of St. Paul.

The views of the Cambridge school are defined by Hort in his unfinished work on the Apocalypse,

[1] Barth, *Einleitung in das N.T.*, 1908.
[2] Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, p. xlviii. f.

containing an Introduction and notes on chaps. i.-iii., which was published in 1908. His main reason for deciding in favour of the Neronian date is that the whole tenor of the language about Rome and the Empire, Babylon and the Beast, fits the reign of Nero and the time immediately following, and does not fit the short local reign of terror under Domitian. He can see no evidence that the persecution, which undoubtedly took place during the last few months of Domitian's reign, ever extended beyond Rome, or that it affected any but a few Christians of wealth and standing.

There was nothing, therefore, at this period in the condition of the Empire which justified the dramatic language of passages like chap. xi., which breathes an atmosphere of wild commotion and weltering chaos. On the other hand, the language of the Apocalypse hits off admirably the situation in the years between the persecution of Nero and the accession of Vespasian. The cruel persecution of 64 had been followed by a Jewish war in 66, and two years later Nero committed suicide and plunged the Empire into utter confusion until the accession of Vespasian in 69. In 70 Jerusalem fell. It is this period of complete anarchy that alone can account for the tone of the Apocalypse.[1] The earlier date also seemed to solve the difficulty associated with the Johannine authorship of the book. An interval of twenty-five years between the composition of the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel would, according to Hort, go far towards explaining the acknowledged differences in style, language, and thought between the two books. The period between A.D. 70 and 95 meant not only a considerable advance

[1] Hort, *op. cit.* p. xxvii.

in years on the part of the writer, but a complete change in the aspect of events. Jerusalem had fallen, the Jewish nation as a State was extinct, and a quarter of a century had been spent by St. John in a great Greek city far away from his Palestinian home, a combination of events that was quite sufficient to account for the unlikeness between the Apocalypse and the Gospel.[1]

The last thirty years have, however, witnessed an entire change of view with reference to the date of the book, and the traditional theory is now accepted by all except a very small minority of scholars. It is urged that the earlier date is impossible because—

(1) The condition of the Asiatic Churches as pictured in chaps. i.-iii. demands a more advanced stage of development than is consistent with a date previous to A.D. 70.

(2) The phase of the Nero-redivivus myth represented in the Apocalypse points to a period considerably later than the declining years of the seventh decade.

(3) The worship of the Emperor, who is personified in the Apocalypse as the Beast, was not enforced to the extent that is required by the contents of the book until the reign of Domitian.

A date later than Domitian is ruled out by the considerations that his successor, Nerva, did not continue his repressive policy, and that when we reach the days of Trajan the provincial administration which is implied in the Apocalypse is being replaced by direct Imperial action, as we find from the correspondence of Pliny.

Contemporary scholarship is then decidedly in

[1] Hort, *op. cit.* p. xii.

favour of a date towards the end of the reign of Domitian, between A.D. 90 and 96, as being both in accord with primitive tradition and with the internal evidence of the book itself.

S. Reinach claims to have found a definite indication of the year of writing in chap. vi. 6, " A measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny, and the oil and the wine hurt thou not." He suggests that this verse fixes A.D. 93 as the date of the book, because in 92 Domitian forbade the cultivation of the vine in the provinces and then revised the order in the following year, which would explain the author's expectation that wine would be abundant and grain scarce. Ramsay,[1] however, points out that the passage in the Apocalypse is the statement of a great moral principle which regulated the limits of devastation during warfare in the Levant world. Annual crops might be ravaged, but the country is spared the almost irretrievable ruin which would have resulted in the Mediterranean lands if the vine and the olive had been destroyed. Reinach has therefore misapprehended the meaning of the allusion in the Apocalypse, which has in view this principle, and not an evanescent and useless, though well-intended effort, by Domitian to regulate agriculture in Italy.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE APOCALYPSE. — The problem associated with the authorship of the book is as old as Dionysius of Alexandria (*circa* A.D. 260), who in the second volume of his work Περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν, as quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.* vii. 25. 1-2), was the first to express doubts as to its being the genuine work of St. John the Apostle. In the present unsettled state

[1] Ramsay, *Expositor*, viii. 1. p. 161 f.; *Cities of St. Paul*, p. 431.

of opinion regarding the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel the acceptance of the hypothesis of a common author for the Apocalypse and the Gospel does not necessarily imply that the former was written by John, the son of Zebedee.

THE RELATION OF THE APOCALYPSE TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL.—The problem of the authorship, as far as it can be determined, resolves itself primarily then into an enquiry as to the relationship between the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel.

Language and Style.—In the matter of vocabulary there are eight words which are found in these two books only, while a fair number of terms are used in a characteristic sense in both works. Of the latter the most striking are *μαρτυρία* and *νικάω* (in the sense of conquering by seeming defeat). On the other hand the Apocalypse contains an admixture of Pauline phraseology, consisting of such words as *κηρύσσειν*, *μετανοεῖν*, *μυστήριον*, *κληρονομεῖν*, *συγκοινωνεῖν*, which is not found in the Gospel, but it betrays no knowledge of many of the key-words of the latter.[1]

Grammar.—The grammar of the Apocalypse was criticised adversely by Dionysius, who found in the book many "solecisms" and "idiotisms." The former consist mainly of instances of complete disregard of the laws of Greek concord, such as nominatives placed in apposition to other cases; cf. i. 5, *ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός*, and mistakes with regard to numbers, genders, and cases, as *e.g.* vii. 9, *καὶ ἰδοὺ ὄχλος πολὺς . . . ἑστῶτες*; xii. 5, *ἔτεκεν υἱόν, ἄρσεν*; xxi. 14, *τὸ τεῖχος . . . ἔχων*. Among the "idiotisms" we may place such a phrase as

[1] See Swete, *op. cit.* p. 115 f.

i. 4, ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος; the utter indifference displayed towards normal usage in the matter of cases followed by certain verbs and adjectives such as ὅμοιος followed by a genitive, i. 13, and διδάσκειν and αἰνεῖν followed by a dative; and the many unusual constructions which characterise the book. It is quite evident that to the author of the Apocalypse Greek was a secondary language whose constructions and idioms he had never thoroughly mastered. And yet he writes with remarkable ease, and has, in spite of his absolute indifference to the ordinary rules of Greek syntax, produced literature which in its own field is unsurpassed.[1]

Style.—The Apocalypse is written in a style which distinguishes it from every other book in the New Testament. This is seen mainly in the use of a considerable number of characteristic phrases and turns of expression. Among these we may note such expressions as οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, and the combination πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός which continually recurs, and the use of the instrumental dative as in ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, ἐν ῥάβδῳ. To these we may add the great frequency with which a large number of ordinary words, of which Swete gives a list of seventy-five, occur in almost every page of the book. When we turn to the Gospel we find it completely devoid of the irregularities which disfigure the Apocalypse in the shape of anacolutha and false concords.

In respect of grammar and style it stands entirely distinct from the roughnesses and eccentricities of the Apocalypse. On the other hand, there are several unusual constructions, which are common to the two

[1] Swete, *op. cit.* p. 120.

books, and the Evangelist has many points of resemblance with the writer of the Apocalypse, both in regard to the formation of sentences and the phrasing of his thoughts.

Modern scholarship as a whole regards the literary phenomena as absolutely fatal to the hypothesis of the common authorship of the Gospel and Apocalypse. Swete is, however, of opinion that the evidence creates a strong presumption of affinity between the two books, notwithstanding their great diversity both in language and thought.

Hort, as we have seen, attempts to bridge the gulf between the two documents by postulating an interval of twenty-five years between them, which, in his opinion, would fully account for all the divergences in language and outlook. The difficulty here is, however, that the Greek of the Gospel is not that of the Apocalypse in an improved and polished condition. The difference is not concerned merely with a relative knowledge of Greek, but is essentially due to the personal individuality which the style reveals.

Zahn [1] maintains that the peculiar style of the Apocalypse is due, not to ignorance of Greek, but in particular instances to intention, and to the dependence of the visions themselves and their literary form upon the models of the prophetic writings of the Old Testament. He also suggests that the more polished Greek of the Gospel may be due to the Gospel having been revised by friends of St. John more familiar with Greek than himself, while the Apocalypse was left in its original unpolished condition.

In the opinion of the present writer the literary

[1] Zahn, *op. cit.* vol. iii. p. 432.

evidence, while allowing of some considerable affinities in language and style, is decisive against the identity of authorship, and this conclusion is amply corroborated by the differences in thought between the two books. The *Christologies* of the Gospel and Apocalypse are as wide apart as the poles. A very striking illustration of this radical divergence is provided by the manner in which our Lord is represented as speaking in the respective documents. "The writer of the Fourth Gospel has a very definite conception of how the Lord spoke on earth, and it is difficult to think that the same writer at any period should have represented Him as speaking after the manner—the quite distinct and sustained manner—in which He speaks in the Apocalypse." [1] This is also largely true of the *eschatological outlook* in the two, and the difference extends to most of the more prominent conceptions which are common to the two writers. The evidence, as a whole, is, therefore, decidedly unfavourable to the presumption that the Apocalypse proceeded from the same hand as the Fourth Gospel.

Was the Apocalypse written by St. John the Apostle? —If the Gospel was not written by St. John the Apostle it is a possible hypothesis that the Apocalypse may have been his work. In favour of the Apostolic authorship is urged the tone which the writer takes throughout the book. "John writes with the tone of absolute authority, and carries this tone to an extreme far beyond that even of the other Apostles, Peter and Paul, in writing to Christian Churches. . . . These letters could only have been written by one who felt himself, and had the right to feel, charged with the superintendence and oversight of all these

[1] Armitage Robinson, *Journal of Theological Studies* (1908), p. 9

Churches, invested with Divinely given and absolute authority over them, gifted by long knowledge and sympathy with insight into their nature and circumstances." [1] He never calls himself an Apostle because there was no need to, seeing that he was the only person of his name known to the Seven Churches. It is also maintained that the Apocalyptist in many respects shows some affinity to the John of the Synoptic Gospels. He also is a son of thunder; he calls down fire from Heaven; his aversion to the enemies of the Church is whole-hearted. The Christ of the Apocalypse is One whose prominent characteristic is unbounded power showing itself in a just severity, and the colouring here is not unlike that which John, the son of Zebedee, one of the Boanerges, might have been expected to impart. The Tübingen school attributed the book to St. John because of the narrow Jewish spirit displayed throughout it.[2] Those who refuse to assign the Apocalypse to the Apostle point out that the writer never calls himself an Apostle, and that it is highly improbable that an Apostle would have spoken as he does in xxi. 14 of the names of "the twelve Apostles of the Lamb" being written on the twelve foundation-stones of the city. It is also asserted that he betrays no evidence whatsoever that he had been an eye-witness of Jesus upon earth, or that he had a close acquaintance with the Synoptic tradition as a whole. If we accept the theory, with which we have dealt elsewhere,[3] that St. John suffered early martyrdom at the hands of the Jews, the authorship of the Apocalypse, as well as that of the Fourth Gospel, is decisively ruled out.

[1] Ramsay, *Expositor*, vi. 9. p. 85.
[2] Swete, *op. cit.* p. clxxvii.
[3] See pp. 378-380.

The balance of probabilities is decidedly against the supposition that the Apocalypse was written by St. John the Apostle.

Failing St. John, who was the Author?—There is no sound reason for doubting that the author was really named John. The hypothesis that the Apocalypse of St. John, like apocalyptic literature in general, is pseudepigraphic is not warranted by the facts in this instance. The letters are addressed to a definite circle of readers, and the book as a whole deals with actual historic events. In this respect the Apocalypse differs widely from all other compositions of a similar type, which are generally devoid of any data of a specific and definite character. Various suggestions have been offered as to the identity of the John of the Apocalypse. Dionysius mentions John Mark as a possible solution but only to reject it. The fatal objection to this suggestion is that the Evangelist is never spoken of as John, but always as Mark or John Mark.

The great majority of scholars ascribe the Apocalypse to John the Elder, and, in the absence of any really conclusive evidence, this hypothesis perhaps brings us as near the truth as we can get. What we learn from the book as to the personality and qualities of its author is quite compatible with the little that we know of John the Elder. He was a member of the Johannine school in Asia Minor, which would account for the general affinities in thought and style between the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel, and, if tradition is to be believed, he would be in sympathy with the chiliastic ideas which are found in the Apocalypse.

The Interpretation of the Apocalypse.—The origin of the latter-day principles of interpreting the

Apocalypse may be traced to the Roman Catholics of the seventeenth century, who were concerned to defend their Church against the exegetical methods of the Protestant Reformers, who identified Rome with the Scarlet Woman and saw in the Beast a personification of the Pope.

The most prominent of these scholars was Alcazar (1614), a Spanish Jesuit, who urged that Revelation i.-xi. was directed against Judaism and the remainder of the book against Imperial paganism. This effort to explain the Apocalypse in the light of its own time was carried forward by Grotius, and after him by a line of scholars reaching down to the latter half of the nineteenth century, when this method of interpretation found strong advocates in Lücke, Bleek, Ewald, and Volkmar. These writers, as we have already pointed out, adopted the Neronian date, regarded the book as written chiefly against Rome, and identified the number of the Beast, 666, with Nero-redivivus.

The contemporary-historical method was not, however, without its rivals, and some scholars saw in the book a summary of Church history, while others, the "futurists," read into its predictions a reference to the events of the Last Days. The latter point of view is still held by Zahn. Archbishop Benson and Dr. W. Milligan were wont to regard the Apocalypse as containing a Christian philosophy of history. The method of interpretation which takes its stand on the circumstances of the age and locality to which the book belongs now commands all but universal acceptance. There is a tendency, however, among present-day scholars to exaggerate the "contemporary-historical" aspect of the Apocalypse and

to leave out of sight the true prophetic character of the book. It is frequently taken for granted that the purpose of the book is exhausted when it is described as published "to nerve the faithful who were persecuted for refusing to admit the presumptuous divine claims of the Emperor." [1] The book makes the most definite claims to be a prophecy, and any principles of interpretation which neglect this aspect of the Apocalypse, which for the Church in all ages is incomparably the most important, must be pronounced inadequate. The writer places himself in line with the great prophets of the Old Testament, with Isaiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Daniel. Like them he is concerned with contemporary events, and his prophecy, like theirs, owed its origin to the perils and fears of the faithful of his own day. Yet none the less he, like them, is concerned with the future. They announced the Divine purpose of God in the establishment of His Kingdom upon earth, and prepared the way for its realisation.[2] He too was able to read the secrets of God's general purpose in the evolution of events, and to detect the greater forces which are at work in human life under all its vicissitudes, and to indicate the issues towards which history tends.[3]

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 508.
[2] Kirkpatrick, *The Doctrine of the Prophets*, p. 15
[3] Swete, *op. cit.* p. cexii.

GENERAL INDEX

Achaia, 230
Acts of the Apostles. See Synopsis of Chap. II. Book II., also 5, 32, 67, 184, 320
Adonis, 72, 79, 82, 135
Agape, in cult of Attis, 125
  Christian, 348
Alexandria, 297, 364
Alexandrian Judaism, 316
  philosophy, 297
  thought, 369, 387
Alogi, 382-384
Amanuensis, 287, 289
Anselm, 39
Antichrist, 265, 266, 362, 439
Antioch, 79, 238, 239, 240, 249, 349, 350, 351, 364
Apocalypse of St. John. See Synopsis of Chap. XI. Book II., also 89, 354, 366, 369, 380, 381, 386, 414, 429
Apocalyptic literature, 8, 87-90, 159, 347, 435, 440, 442, 443
Apocalyptic, motive of, 90, 91
Apocryphal Gospels, 200
Apollos, 298, 301
Apostles. See under Twelve, also 272, 354, 355, 366, 371, 398
Apostolic Decrees, 243-247
  Council, 242, 245, 247, 250, 251
  period, 398; sub-apostolic period, 398
  Fathers, 370; sub-apostolic Fathers, 370, 381, 382
Apuleius, 127, 143
Aquila, 295, 298, 302, 303
Aramaic, 163, 175
Aristion, 304
Aristophanes, 300
Aristotle, 165, 297, 316, 337
Asia Minor, 229, 329, 375, 376, 386, 426, 433, 440, 453
Athanasius, 39
Attis, 71, 72, 75, 77, 79, 82, 125, 126, 130, 134, 142
Augustine, 39, 228, 318

Baptism, 142, 147-152, 410
  for the dead, 149, 152
Bar-Cochba, 362
Barnabas, 46, 238, 239, 249, 298, 299
  Epistle of, 365
Baruch, Apocalypse of, 89
Basilides, 384
Beast, the, in the Apocalypse, 445, 446, 454
Beatitudes, the, 210
Bezae, Codex, 243, 244
Boor, De, Fragment, 378
Britain, 126, 127
Bunyan, John, 186, 320

Caesarea, 199, 238, 239, 240, 301
Calendars, 378, 379
Canon, Muratorian, 346, 353, 364, 379, 385
Canon of New Testament, 318, 340, 429
Capernaum, 392
Carthage, 364
  Council of, 354
Celsus, 84
Century, first, significance of end of, in history of the Church, 397, 398
Century, nineteenth, literary criticism in, 4
  New Testament criticism in, 4
Century, twentieth, significance of, in the history of religion, 3, 4, 13
  criticism, 5, 6, 13

Cerinthus, 383, 384, 427, 428, 437
Christ Jesus, birth, 219, 222, 291
Christ Jesus, Virgin birth, 61, 63, 392
Genealogies, 391
Connection with Nazareth, 71, 85, 392
Childhood, 219, 300
Baptism, 201, 209, 216, 392, 407
Temptation, 201, 209, 216, 392, 406, 407
Transfiguration, 77, 392, 406, 407
Parables, 80, 106, 109, 204, 209, 210, 221, 392, 408, 417
Miracles, 63, 209, 393, 404, 405
Ministry, 392, 396, 398, 405
in Galilee, 404, 411, 412
in Judaea, 404, 411, 412
Teaching, 42, 43, 49, 50, 53, 80, 81, 409, 411
Sayings, 190, 207-219, 317, 327
Discourses, 393, 407-411
Charge to the Twelve, 212
Institution of the Eucharist, 406, 412, 416
Agony in the Garden, 301, 392, 406, 407
Passion Story, 72, 73, 209, 214-217, 219, 404
Cross, the, 77, 78, 136, 145, 146, 161, 224
Death and Resurrection, 41, 42, 71, 72, 82, 84, 135, 137, 148, 151, 192, 220, 317, 324, 338
Post-Resurrection appearances, 219, 220, 222, 372
Ascension, 392, 406, 407
Christ, the, of Eschatology. See Synopsis of Chap. VI. Book I.
eschatological environment, 103-104
eschatological teaching, 104-107
not an Interimsethik, 107-111
as Warrior Prince, 112
as Son of Man, 112, 115
as Judge of quick and dead, 115, 320
as Son of God, 115, 116, 320, 407
as Suffering Servant of the Lord, 116, 117
fulfilment of His eschatological predictions, 118-119
Parousia, 135
Christ Jesus, Messianic claims, 317, 324, 393, 413
Christ-Myth. See Synopsis of Chap. V. Book I., also 8, 23
Historic Christ. See Christ-Myth
Evidence for the existence of, 83, 84
Identity of historical Jesus with the Christ of worship. See Synopsis of Chap. IV. Book I. "Jesus or Christ," and of Chap. V. Book I. "Jesus or Paul," also 29-32, 52, 59, 402, 406
Historic humanity emphasised by the Liberal German School, 22-23
Person of Christ, the—
Storm centre of twentieth-century criticism, 6, 13
Harnack's conception of, 15-17
Schmiedel's conception of, 17-19
Carpenter's conception of, 20
R. Roberts' conception of, 27
Pfleiderer's conception of, 62
Loisy's conception of, 62-64, 143-144
Kalthoff's conception of, 68-69
See also under Christology
Subliminal consciousness the seat of the Divine, 33-35
Place of, in the Christian system, 57, 59
The pre-Christian Jesus, 69, 70, 77
The pre-existent Christ, 37, 38
Union of Christian with, 149, 279
Prerogatives of, 275
His controversy with the Jews, 413
Relation to the Baptist, 414
Relation to the Father, 416
The Mediator, 423-424
His method of speaking, 451
Christianity, Jewish, 252, 253, 306, 307, 308, 309, 319, 322, 328, 330, 336, 349, 350, 351, 356
Gentile, 306, 307, 308, 322, 328, 330, 338, 349, 351, 356
"Reduced," 20, 29, 31, 360, 361
Christology, psychological conception, 12, 32-35
in the twentieth century, 12, 13
Liberal Protestant. See Synopsis of Chap. III. Book I.

Christology of the primitive Church, 57
Synoptic, 52, 56, 81, 82, 360, 392-396
of the Fourth Gospel, 359, 360, 392, 396, 401, 402, 406-410, 414, 418
of St. Luke's Gospel, 225
of the Acts, 257, 288
Pauline, 38, 52-54, 56, 57, 78, 79, 385
of the Epistle to the Ephesians, 273, 274, 275
of the Epistle of St. James, 322-324
of the Apocalypse, 437, 451
Chrysostom, 379
Church, Christian, 110, 111, 119
Cicero, 290, 325
Clement, Alex., 152, 243, 246, 298, 318, 330, 346, 353, 361, 364, 379
Clement, Rom., 311, 318, 342, 365, 369, 375
Clementine literature, 368, 414
Colossians, Epistle to, 271, 308, 348, 385, 414
Corinth, Church of, 49, 155, 270, 309, 348
Corinthians, Epistles to, 262, 275, 309, 317
Cornelius, 239, 240, 242
Cosmogonies, Pauline, 140
Cross, the, significance of, 145, 146
Cybele, 125, 126, 130, 132, 134
Cyprian, 208, 243, 354

Daniel, 89, 436, 443, 455
Demas, 432
Demetrius, 432
Didachē, 77, 323, 347, 365, 431
Diognetus, letter to, 318, 324
Dionysius of Alexandria, 318, 441, 448, 453
Dionysus, 71, 72, 77, 79, 83, 125, 130, 132
Diotrephes, 431, 432, 433, 434
Dispersion, the, 314, 321
Churches of the Western, 319, 385
Churches of the Eastern, 319
Docetism, 414, 427, 428, 431
Domitian, 312, 346, 441, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447

Ebed-Jesu, 384
Egypt, 172, 174, 199
Egypt Exploration Society, 165
Egypt, religion of. See Religions
Electa, 430
Eleusinian Mysteries. See Mysteries
Elijah, 84, 99, 100, 319
Emperor-worship, 445, 446
Enoch, books of, 88, 89, 96, 98, 113, 159, 337, 344, 347, 442
Enrolment described by St. Luke, 177
Ephesians, Epistle to, 264, 271-277, 336, 375, 385
Ephesus, 257, 285, 375, 376, 414, 426, 432
Church of, 376, 377, 440
Epictetus, 123
Epiphanius, 383, 384, 444
Episcopacy, 433, 434
Eschatology. See Synopsis of Chap. VI. Book I., also 8, 24, 135, 374, 400, 425
of the Gospels, 103-107
transmuted, 107
Esdras, 89
Eucharist, 49, 63, 64, 82, 142, 152-156, 160, 217, 372
Eusebius, 207, 318, 345, 354, 361, 365, 366, 367, 382, 447
Ezekiel, 89, 442, 443, 455
Ezra, Fourth Book of, 88

Faith, Pauline doctrine of, 146
Feasts, Jewish, 373
Francis, St., 226

Gaius, 384, 428, 431, 432
Galatia, Churches of, 42, 249, 250
Galatians, Epistle to, 243, 247-252, 312, 317, 385
Galilee, 385, 409
Gallio, 230
Gaul, 364
Georgius Hamartolus, 378
Gilgamesh, 7, 10, 66-68, 69
Gnosticism, 347, 361, 362, 384, 414, 415, 427, 428
Semi-Gnosticism, 400
God-fearers, 148, 398
God, eating of the, 154
Gospels, Schmiedel's criticism of, 18
Synoptic. See Synopsis of Chap. I. Book II., also 5, 14, 37, 56, 62, 82, 271, 317, 360, 369, 370, 375, 382, 391-394, 402-416, 418, 419

Gospel of St. Matthew, 183, 190-226, 366, 377, 386, 403
of St. Mark, 46, 58, 183, 190-226, 258, 354, 355, 366, 377, 382, 403, 404, 410, 411, 417
of St. Luke, 31, 184, 190-226, 258, 259, 260, 382, 403
of St. John, 5, 82, 183, 184, 271, 422-426, 427, 429, 445, 448-452. See also Synopsis of Chaps. VIII. and IX., Book II.
Gospels, literary evolution of, 223-226
Apocryphal, 200
Graeco-Roman world, 57, 70, 72, 120-126, 398, 399, 401
Greek, Attic, 182
Biblical, 175, 176
Koine, 167, 168, 175, 181
literary Hellenistic, 163, 167
Greek thought and philosophy, 122, 158, 401
Gregory of Nyssa, 379

Hadrian, 362
Hebrews, Epistle to the. See Synopsis of Chap. IV. Book II., also 185, 317, 324, 337, 400
Hegesippus, 345
Hellenic Judaism. See Judaism.
Hellenism, 387
Hellenistic literature and culture, 325
Heracleon, 353, 364, 379
Hermas, Shepherd of, 314, 323, 353, 365
Hermetic mystery literature, 129, 130
Herod, 379
Herodotus, 337
Hippocrates, 300
Hippolytus, 384
Homer, 234, 337
House-Church, 303, 310

Ieoud, 71, 72
Ignatius, 318, 347, 365, 376, 433, 434
Individualism, growth of Jewish, 93, 94
Inscriptions, 8, 164, 165, 166, 289, 435
Inspiration, mechanical, 163
Interimsethik, 107-111
Irenaeus, 246, 318, 330, 341, 353, 361, 366, 375, 383, 384
Isaiah, 92, 93, 96, 442, 443, 455
Deutero-, 94
Isis, 75, 126, 127, 130, 134, 140, 143

James, St., the Great, 377, 379
the Lord's brother, 78, 313, 314, 315
Epistle of. See Synopsis of Chap. V. Book II., also 184, 185, 337
Jeremiah, 94
Jerome, 318, 328
Jerusalem, 46, 47, 231, 259, 302, 319, 375, 385, 392, 410, 440, 445
Church of, 238-241, 249, 254, 314
destruction of, 256, 258, 260, 311, 373, 374, 445
Jesus-ben-Pandira, 70, 85
Jews, controversy with, 413, 427. See also Judaism.
Joanna, 221, 222
Johannine literature. See Synopsis of Chaps. VIII.-XI. Book II.
John, St., the Apostle, 361, 363, 365, 367, 371, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 386, 388, 395, 446, 447, 448
early martyrdom of alleged, 375, 377-379, 452
John, St., Epistles of. See Synopsis of Chap. X. Book II., also 329, 365, 366, 380, 381, 386, 414
the Presbyter, 365, 367, 386, 388, 429, 433, 434, 452, 453
John the Baptist, 61, 66, 105, 110, 200, 201, 403, 409, 413, 414
Josephus, 163, 255
Joshua, 70, 77, 84
Jubilees, Book of, 89, 96
Judaea, 409
Judaean ministry. See under Christ
Judaism, 6, 68, 76, 80, 93, 252, 253, 301, 306, 308, 309, 311, 337, 362, 373, 374, 387, 399, 401, 413, 436, 442
Alexandrian, 316, 400
Hellenistic, 316
Judaistic controversy, 244, 245, 246, 247, 250, 251, 307, 317, 321, 322
Jude, St., Epistle of. See Synopsis of Chap. VII. Book II.
Justification by faith, 54, 55
Justin Martyr, 84, 318, 324, 353, 365, 367, 368, 369, 371, 382, 410

Kingdom of God, development of Jewish doctrine of, 92-95
in the Fourth Gospel, 392
in the Synoptic Gospels, 103-107, 392
Kingdom of God realised in the world, 119
Kronian myth, 71

Language of our Lord and the Apostles, 174
of the New Testament. See Synopsis of Chap. VIII. Book I.
Law, the (Mosaic), 49-52, 54, 55, 317
(Graeco-Roman), 158
Lazarus, raising of, 372, 392, 405, 417, 419
Legal terms and ideas, Pauline, 178, 199
Letters from ostraka, 171
Papyri, 169-171, 180
to the Seven Churches, 380, 439, 441, 452
Logos, 71, 368, 369, 383, 392, 401, 402, 425
Lord's Supper, the. See Eucharist.
Luke, St., 205, 217, 225, 233, 234, 241, 242, 298, 299, 300, 318, 391
Gospel of. See under Gospels
Lystra, Paul's speech at, 307

Maccabees, Books of, 89, 96
the, 96
Marduk, 7, 439
Mark, St., 46, 239, 337, 453
Gospel of. See under Gospels
Martyrologies, 378, 379
Mary and Martha, 63, 408, 417
Matthew, St., 366, 379
Gospel of. See under Gospels
Meleager, 325
Menippus, 325
Messiah, the, as Warrior Prince, 97, 101, 112
development of Jewish doctrine of, 95-100
the Levitic, 96, 97
Mithra, 71, 72, 73-76, 82, 127-129, 130, 135
Montanism, 362, 383
Moses, 66
Assumption of, 89, 95, 96, 347
Muratorian Canon. See under Canon

Mysteries, Eleusinian, 72, 123, 124, 147
Mystery Play, 72, 84
Religions. See under Religions
Mysticism, Hellenistic and Oriental, 122
in the Old Testament, 139, 140, 156-160
Pauline, 122, 136, 139, 140

Nationalism, Jewish, 92, 94
Nazarene, 71
Nazareth, 71, 392
Nazarite, 71
Nero, 254, 333, 334, 441, 444, 445
Nero-redivivus Myth, 265, 446, 454
New Testament, books of, as literature, 181-186
language of. See under Language
Nicodemus, 367, 392, 405, 408, 410

Opus operatum, 148, 160
Oral hypothesis, 191-193
Origen, 39, 243, 296, 298, 330, 346, 353, 356
Orphism, 123
Osiris, 126, 127, 130, 134, 143
Ostraka, 8, 164, 165, 167
Oxyrhynchus, sayings of Jesus discovered at, 165, 211

Palestine, 385, 386, 440
Churches of, 302, 349
Pan-Babylonian School, 7
Papyri, 8, 164, 165, 166, 174, 289, 430, 431
Parousia, 266, 400
Paschal controversy, 362
Passion narrative, 214-217
Pastoral Epistles, 264, 277-291, 348, 375
Patristic writers, 173, 351, 370
Paul, St., "Jesus or Paul" controversy. See Synopsis of Chap. IV. Book I.
His alleged mischievous influence upon Christianity, 37
Wrede's theory of his Christology, 37, 39
His acquaintance with the facts of the life of Christ, 41, 42
His acquaintance with the facts of the teaching of Christ, 42-44
The persecutor, 43-44

Paul, St., The missionary, 44
Date of conversion, 45
Had he known Jesus in the flesh ? 46-48
Teaching concerning the Law, 49-51, 54
Teaching concerning the Person of Christ, 52-54
Difference between the Christology of Paul and that of the Synoptists explained, 56-57
Connection with the Twelve, 57-58
Influence upon St. Mark's Gospel, 58
Significance of his evidence for the existence of the historic Jesus, 78-79
Drews' conception of his preaching, 78-80
"St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions." See Synopsis of Chap. VII. Book I.
Sacramental teaching, 133 - 135, 142, 147-156
Pauline eschatology, 135
His conception of salvation, 137, 142, 144-146
His terminology, 137, 140 - 142, 158, 159
Influences which determined his thought, 155-161, 399
Literary style, 185
Use of an amanuensis, 185, 287, 288
His social position, 186
Combination with St. Peter, 231
Comparison with Aeneas, 234
His narrative in Gal. i. ii., 243-247
Intercourse with St. Luke, 228, 237
His mission to the Gentile world, 239
Journeys to Jerusalem, 240
Circumcision of Timothy, 247, 251
Silence with regard to the Apostolic decrees, 243, 245
First Missionary journey, 249
Attitude at the Apostolic Council, 250-251
Alleged circumcision of Titus, 251
Attitude towards Judaism and Jewish Christianity, 253-254
Attitude towards the Law, 253
Trial, 256
Rapid change of moods, 270
Paul, St., Champion of Gentiles, 273
Appreciation of the Jews, 273
Pastoral Epistles written within his lifetime, 277, 283-285
Release after the first imprisonment, 283
Imprisonment at Caesarea, 302
Speech at Lystra, 307
Priority of Epistles to that of St. James or *vice versa*, 320, 322
Intercourse with and influence upon St. Peter, 336
Influence upon early Christian thought, 337
St. Jude's indebtedness to the Pauline writings, 347
His authority emphasised by Clement Rom., Ignatius, and Polycarp in preference to that of St. John, 376-377
Influence upon the Fourth Gospel, 385, 399, 400
His Messianic ideas, 401
His Christology. See under Christology
His death, 256, 258
Paul, St., the Epistles of, 5, 41, 45, 46, 67, 78, 179, 180, 182, 184, 185, 236, 237, 322, 330, 335, 348, 349, 353, 355, 385. See also Synopsis of Chap. III. Book II.
Persecution in the Roman Empire, 331-335, 445
Personality, 6, 12, 13
Peter, St., 42, 46, 327, 330, 334, 335, 336, 338, 340, 351, 376, 381, 382
Apocalypse of, 353, 354
first Epistle of. See Synopsis of Chap. VI. Book II., also 184, 185, 271, 317, 324, 351, 352, 353, 355, 366, 375.
second Epistle of, 184, 185, 330, 350, also Synopsis of Chap. VII. Book II.
Speeches of, 32
Pharisees, 374, 413
Philaster, 383
Philemon, Epistle to, 287
Philip of Side, 378
Philippi, 230
Philippians, Epistle to, 263, 273, 377
Philip, St., 46, 239, 240, 241, 298, 301, 302

Philo, 163, 301, 316, 337, 400, 401
Philodemus, 325
Philosophy, Greek, 158, 316, 401
Pilate, 83
  Acts of, 73
Pilgrim's Progress, 186
Plato, 124, 297, 316, 337
Pliny, 290, 332, 334, 446
Plutarch, 163, 290, 337
Poimandres, 129
Polycarp, 318, 340, 347, 365, 377, 426
Pope, the, 454
Prayer, the Lord's, 19, 80, 210
Prisca, 295, 298, 302, 303
Prophets, Old Testament, 166, 442, 443, 450, 455
Protestant Reformers, 454
Pseudepigraphy, 91, 291, 292, 350
Pseudonimity, 291, 292, 339, 340, 349, 352, 355
Psychology, 10, 32, 33
Ptolemy the Great, 126
Pythagoreans, 79

"Q," 104, 190, 201, 207-219, 223

Rabbinic literature, 316
Redeemer-God in the Mystery-Religions, 143, 144
Religion, Assyrian, 435, 436
  Babylonian, 6, 26, 435, 436, 438, 439
  Greek, 7, 72, 121, 123
  Persian, 6, 26
  Roman, 122
  Syrian, 72
Religions, Comparative, 6, 12, 86, 120, 153, 435
  Mystery. See Synopsis of Chap. VII. Book I., also 6, 7, 26, 78, 85, 86
Rewards in the Gospels, 109
Rhetoric, Greek, 297
Roman Catholic Church, 64, 454
Roman Empire, 57, 68, 75, 97, 118, 166, 171, 172, 173, 249, 435, 445
  Provinces, 229, 230, 435
Romans, Epistle to, 262, 308, 309, 312, 317, 335, 336, 356, 383
Rome, 78, 126, 199, 201, 259, 285, 303, 310, 311, 336, 350, 351, 440, 445
Rome, Church of, 309, 310, 311, 361, 364, 371, 381, 382
Ruth, 430

Sacramental meals in the Mystery-cults, 125, 135, 142, 152, 153, 160
Sacraments, 62, 73, 135, 136, 142-157
Sadducees, 374
Salvation, Pauline conception of, 144
  in the Mystery-cults, 142, 143
Samaria, Churches of, 238-241, 249, 254, 351, 352
Sanhedrin, 373
Scientific historical method, 9, 14, 62
Seneca, 123, 233, 234
Septuagint, 157, 163, 289, 316, 337, 346
Serapis, 126, 127, 130, 134, 143
Sermon on the Mount, 19, 80, 110, 317, 392, 408
Servant of the Lord, the, 97, 116, 117
Seventy, the, 298
Shorthand, 288-290
Sibylline oracles, 88, 89
Silas (Silvanus), 240, 339, 342
Simon Magus, 351
Sin, Christ's conception of, 51
  Paul's conception of, 51
Sirach, Wisdom of Ben-, 316
Smyrna, Church of, 377, 440
Solomon, Odes of, 387, 388
  Psalms of, 89, 95, 442
  Wisdom of, 316, 337
Son of Man, the, in Apocalyptic literature, 98, 99
  in the Gospels, 112-115
Stephen, St., 238, 240, 321
Stigmata, 178
Stoics, 122, 316, 401
Strabo, 337
Subliminal self, 10, 33, 34
Synagogue, the, 186, 398
Syncretism, 130
Synoptic Gospels. See under Gospels
  Problem. See Synopsis of Chap. I. Book II.
  tradition, 386, 391-396

Tabernacle ritual, 310, 311
Tacitus, 83, 333
Talmud, 70

Tammuz, 7, 79
Tarsus, 105, 158
Tatian's Diatessaron, 364
Taurobolium, 125
Temple, the, 373, 392, 443
  Cleansing of, 415, 416
Temple-worship, 310
Terminology of Acts, 257-259
  Pauline, 137, 140-142
Tertullian, 39, 147, 243, 298, 330, 346, 354, 364
Testament of Levi, 95
  Old, 267, 306, 307, 317, 321, 352, 399, 423, 443, 444
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 88, 89, 96, 316, 347
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 39
Theodorus, 325
Theophilus, 364
Thessalonians, Epistles to, 264-270
Thessalonica, 230
  Church of, 268-270, 432
Thracian cult, 72, 153
Thucydides, 300, 337
Thyatira, Church of, 432, 440
Timothy, 247, 251, 252, 279, 281, 282, 285, 301, 304
  Epistles to, 264, 277-291
Titus, 251, 281, 282
  Epistle to, 264, 277-291
Trajan, 332, 437, 446
Trypho, 84
Tübingen School, 4, 262, 336, 444, 452

Ur-Marcus, 196-198

Valentinians, 384
Vespasian, 334, 335, 441, 443, 445
Virgil, 233, 234
Vulgate, 366

Wales, 174, 325
Wisdom, Book of, 89
Woman of Samaria, 372, 374
Women, position of, in Asia Minor and Macedonia, 230
Writers, language, style, and culture of New Testament, 181-186, 325, 326

Zechariah, 442, 443, 455

INDEX OF AUTHORS (MODERN)

Abbott, E. A., 185, 189, 193, 358, 378, 384, 395
Alcazar, 454
Allen, W. C., 189, 193, 209, 210, 211, 213, 214
Anderson, K., 64
Askwith, E. H., 358

Bacon, B. W., 28, 188, 189, 227, 262, 263, 271, 338, 358, 359, 360, 375, 376, 379, 380, 386, 388, 389, 439, 440, 441
Barth, 444
Bartlet, V., 188, 193, 215, 220, 248, 261, 276, 283, 284, 294, 348, 359, 432
Baur, 5, 262, 263, 266, 267, 271, 362
Benson, E. W., 454
Beza, 247
Bigg, C., 120, 129, 145, 160, 313, 338, 343
Blass, 162, 235, 276
Bleek, 454
Bousset, 8, 13, 19, 20, 22, 87, 89, 265, 359, 439, 441
Bretschneider, 361
Brooke, A. E., 358, 397, 423, 425, 427
Browning, 420
Bruce, A. B., 294
Buckley, E. R., 189
Burkitt, F. C., 101, 189, 191, 192, 197, 208, 215, 255, 358, 366, 395, 396, 417
Burton, E. D., 189

Calvin, 39, 247
Campbell, R. J., 117
Carpenter, Estlin, 13, 20, 60, 189
Chapman, J., 304, 359, 432
Charles, R. H., 8, 87, 88, 89, 265, 359
Chase, 227, 313, 338, 346
Clemen, 36, 45, 120, 133, 136, 160, 261, 263, 264, 271
Cone, O., 313
Conybeare, F. C., 60, 61, 62, 135, 282, 304
Cumont, 7, 86, 120

Dalman, 112, 113
Deissmann, 8, 10, 120, 157, 162, 165, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 177, 178, 179, 185, 186, 188, 271, 296, 297
Denney, J., 13, 59
Dewick, E. C., 87, 115
Dickie, J., 294
Dieterich, 7, 120, 121, 129
Dill, 7
Dillman, 88
Dobschütz, von, 36, 45, 46, 87, 107
Dodd, C. H., 416
Dods, Marcus, 294
Drews, 60, 65, 76-83, 85, 263
Driver, 174
Drummond, J., 358, 363, 370, 390

Eagar, A. E., 294, 299
Emmet, C. W., 87, 108, 248, 249
Erbes, 437
Evanson, 361
Ewald, 454

Fairbairn, 28
Falconer, R. A., 313, 351
Farnell, 7, 120, 121
Feine, P., 36, 39, 220
Figgis, N., 13, 22, 24
Findlay, 358
Frazer, 60, 120
Friedländer, 89

Gardner, P., 29, 30, 120, 133, 134
Garvie, 34
Glover, T. R., 7
Green, A. V., 358
Grenfell, 165, 289
Grimm, 162
Grotius, 194, 454
Gunkel, 7, 37, 359, 438, 439, 441

Hardy, E. G., 313, 332, 333
Harnack, 5, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 188, 189, 208, 209, 212, 220, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, 234, 235, 238, 239, 240, 245, 255, 256, 258, 259, 261, 268, 269, 271, 276, 287, 294, 295, 302, 303, 306, 310, 324, 336, 340, 341, 358, 378, 387, 388, 395, 429, 431, 433, 434
Harris, Rendel, 88, 302, 313, 337, 358, 384, 387, 429, 430
Harrison, Miss J., 7, 120, 121, 123
Hart, J. H. A., 313
Hartmann, von, 27
Hawkins, Sir J., 189, 191, 193, 209, 211, 216, 217, 220, 229, 230
Headlam, 335
Heitmüller, 120, 121, 133, 148, 153
Hicks, E. L., 302
Hilgenfeld, 88
Holdsworth, W. W., 189, 191, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 204, 209, 211, 214, 221, 222
Holland, H. S., 31
Holtzmann, H., 22, 209, 264, 425
Hort, 276, 290, 313, 321, 334, 336, 359, 444, 445, 446, 450
Hügel, von, 111
Hunt, 165, 289

Jackson, H. L., 189, 358
James, M. R., 88, 354
James, W., 12
Jeremias, 7
Jones, E. G., 28
Jones, Maurice, 227
Jensen, 7, 10, 60, 65-68
Jülicher, 22, 188, 252, 261, 263, 264, 271, 441
Jüngst, 237

Kalthoff, 60, 65, 68, 69, 263
Kennedy, H. A. A., 120, 133, 136, 137, 142, 150, 154, 156, 160, 162, 175
Kirkpatrick, 455
Knowling, 36, 39, 227, 261
Kühl, 329

Lake, K., 120, 133, 134, 148, 149, 160, 227, 245, 248, 261
Lewis, W. M., 301
Lietzmann, 112
Lightfoot, 358, 359, 362, 394, 425, 444
Lock, 261, 271
Loisy, 60, 62, 63, 64, 134, 143, 144, 358, 395, 396
Lücke, 454

Mackintosh, 13, 34
Manen, van, 261, 263
Margoliouth, D. S., 85
Mayor, J. B., 313, 314, 318, 319, 320, 321, 325, 343, 346, 348, 353, 356, 357
McGiffert, 188, 261, 263, 265, 306, 441
Menzies, A., 189
Meyer, A., 36, 37
Milligan, G., 162, 163, 180, 188, 235, 261, 288, 289, 294, 295, 311, 339
Milligan, W., 454
Moffatt, 188, 191, 197, 207, 208, 212, 217, 229, 235, 252, 271, 272, 274, 275, 278, 292, 300, 306-309, 323, 334, 346, 348, 375, 378, 379, 386, 388, 403, 421, 422, 429, 441, 442, 455
Mommsen, 332, 333
Moulton, J. H., 36, 47, 162, 163, 165, 166, 167, 176, 182, 183, 185, 188, 302, 325, 326
Myers, F. W. H., 10, 33

Nägeli, 162
Nairne, A., 294

Oesterley, W. E., 313

Peake, A. S., 188, 255, 441
Pfleiderer, 60, 62, 120, 135
Plummer, A., 204
Porter, F. C., 359, 439, 441

Rackham, 227
Ramsay, W. M., 5, 47, 53, 165, 227, 228, 229, 235, 240, 241, 246, 248, 251, 261, 276, 287, 292, 294, 301, 313, 334, 335, 356, 359, 447, 452

Reinach, S., 447
Reitzenstein, 7, 120, 141
Resch, G., 227, 244
Roberts, R., 26, 27, 28, 31
Robertson, A., 263
Robertson, J. M., 60, 65, 69-76, 263
Round, D., 247
Rushbrooke, 189
Rutherfurd, 261, 276

Sabatier, 441
Saintsbury, 4, 262
Salmon, 189
Salmond, 429
Sanday, 12, 21, 22, 32, 33, 34, 174, 189, 191, 197, 198, 201, 202, 203, 205, 217, 221, 222, 272, 288, 313, 334, 335, 354, 359, 363, 370, 372, 394, 408, 426
Schmidt, 252
Schmiedel, 13, 17, 18, 19, 28, 31, 228, 255, 332, 358, 362, 375, 393, 395, 396, 419, 426
Scott, C. A., 39, 50, 359
Scott, E. F., 87, 358, 375, 396, 399, 451, 417
Schürer, 8, 87, 88, 252, 306
Schwartz, 379
Schweitzer, 10, 21, 22, 24, 86, 87, 101, 105, 108, 120, 133, 135, 137, 139, 150, 151, 152, 154, 157
Selwyn, E. C., 359
Shaw, R., 261
Smith, W. B., 65, 69
Soden, von, 36, 60, 261, 264, 294, 297, 306, 313
Souter, A., 261, 274
Spitta, 237, 326, 437
Stanton, 189, 190, 193, 198, 199, 209, 213, 215, 219, 221, 255, 359, 363, 367, 370, 377, 378, 384
Stawell, Miss, 233
Strachan, R. H., 313, 387
Strauss, 60
Streeter, 116, 211, 213, 216, 218, 220, 223, 226
Swete, 304, 334, 359, 419, 420, 442, 444, 448, 449, 452, 455

Thackeray, H. S. J., 162
Thorburn, T. H., 60, 83
Tyrrell, G., 21, 64

Vischer, 437
Volkmar, 88, 454
Völter, 437

Weber, 247
Weinel, 19, 28, 36
Weiss, B., 218, 329
Weiss, J., 36, 46, 60, 83, 101, 108, 209
Weizsäcker, 188, 228, 236, 264, 306, 441
Wellhausen, 19, 22, 90, 189, 193, 219
Wendland, 7
Wendling, 206
Wernle, 149
Westcott, 191, 294, 359, 394, 422, 444
Wickham, E. C., 294
Wilcken, 165
Williams, N. P., 198, 204, 207
Winckler, 7
Workman, H. B., 313
Wrede, 36, 37, 38, 39, 56, 261, 267, 268, 269, 296
Wright, A., 189, 192, 204, 417

Zahn, 174, 188, 194, 235, 236, 276, 330, 333, 339, 343, 348, 350, 363, 378, 385, 394, 450
Zimmern, 7

THE END

The Evangelical
School of Theology

Printed by Lowe & Brydone (Printers) Ltd., *London, N.W. 1*

50.4.10

DATE DUE

BS
2350
.J6
1924

50,840

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN See Librarian
Jones, Mauric New Testament in the Twen
3 0645 0001 2519 1